

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers may have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, DECEMBER 13, 1873.

FURTHER DEFECTS in the Ballot Act are gradually coming to light as the working of it is tested in successive Parliamentary and Municipal elections. In our remarks upon the Act immediately after it passed (16 S. J. 861) we pointed out that the counterfoil system had been very hastily introduced into the Bill in the House of Lords, and that the amendments requisite to engraft this system upon the scheme of the original Bill had been very imperfectly made. We also remarked that there was no provision at all for the inspection of tendered ballot papers; that in the case in which a scrutiny is resorted to perhaps more often than any other—viz., where one candidate is disqualified, and notice of it has been given, the provisions in the Act were such that no scrutiny could be had at all without putting a violent and unnatural construction upon the Act, which it is quite uncertain whether the Courts will do. It is especially in the provision for the inspection of documents that the difficulties occur, and perhaps they are rather more numerous in the case of Municipal elections than in that of Parliamentary elections. Thus last year the Barnstaple Municipal Election Petition drew attention (see 17 S. J. 200) to the difficulty in procuring inspection of documents by order of the county court, caused by the county court only sitting once a month, and the judge having no power to act out of court. This year a petition relating to the Manchester Municipal Election has been presented in respect of an alleged miscounting of votes, and also in respect of votes alleged to have been given by the same person in different wards. In such a case it has been decided (*Reg. v. Harrold*, 21 W. R. 910) that the vote first given is good, but the others are bad. For the purpose of this petition it became necessary to inspect the marked copies of the registers used in the different wards, showing which burgesses had voted. These being "documents other than ballot papers" should have been, by the 42nd rule of the schedule, open to public inspection, according to certain regulations. But although open to public inspection they were, by the 29th rule, to be sealed up by the presiding officer in one packet with the counterfoils, and this packet the 37th section declares that the returning officer at the election shall not open, but shall forward, in the case of a municipal election, to the town clerk; and the 41st rule, coupled with the 64th, declares that no person shall open the packet of counterfoils except by order of the county court or of a tribunal having cognizance of petitions. Thus a document which is to be open to inspection is to be in a packet which no one may open.

The origin of this absurdity is easily seen by anyone who compares the original Bill with the Act. It results from putting the words "counterfoils, etc." into several of the sections and rules, amongst others the 29th rule, without observing the effect on others. The 42nd rule was in the original Bill and was not altered. The fact is that the present Attorney-General was almost the only member of the House who had sufficient practical knowledge of the subject to enable him effectively to correct

the wording of amendments upon points of detail. He was then strongly opposed to the counterfoil system, and of course did nothing to assist in incorporating it successfully with the Bill. It is to be hoped that he will have seen by this time that the system is not really open to the objections which he entertained to it, and that he will before the general election introduce a bill, which ought to pass as a matter of course, amending the Act of 1872 in those points in which the elections which have taken place have shown it to be defective. We have not space now to enumerate fully all these defects; they have mostly been commented upon by us from time to time, and the greater number of them are pointed out in the article (16 S. J. 681) to which we have already referred. Although taken singly they are not any of them of very great importance, yet on the whole they are worth attention.

THE POSITION of a bishop of the Church of England in these days of violent theological controversy is certainly attended with many anxieties, and we can understand and sympathise to some extent with the feelings of these clergymen, to whom even the attractions of a seat in the House of Lords and the glories of a "palace" seem insufficient compensation for the absence of a quiet life. The fierce light which is supposed to beat upon the royal throne is not to be compared in intensity with the fervent rays directed by the partisans of rival ecclesiastical schools of thought upon the episcopal throne of their distracted diocesan. Scarcely a week passes without somebody wanting to prosecute somebody else, and to the heavy burthen already borne by our bishops, Dr. Archibald Stephens has just attempted to add a last straw. Fortunately for the episcopal order he has failed. Indeed, we have great difficulty in seeing upon what possible ground he could have hoped to succeed. The Lord Chancellor described the attempt as "quite unfounded and absolutely frivolous," and Lord Justice Mellish entirely agreed with this opinion. It appears to us, if we may say so with respect, that these expressions of judicial disapprobation really fall short of what might have been fairly expected under the circumstances of the case.

Dr. Stephen's application to Vice-Chancellor Bacon, and afterwards to the Court of Appeal, on behalf of the Rev. Mr. Edwards, the Vicar of Prestbury, was for a prohibition to the Bishop of Gloucester to prevent a commission from being issued by the bishop to inquire into certain charges made against the vicar in respect of what we may roughly call Ritualistic practices, and it seems beyond all question to have been utterly devoid of foundation. It was contended that before issuing the commission the bishop was bound to exercise a judicial discretion, and that in the present case he had not done so. The complainant, it was stated, was a Dissenter, and therefore a person to whose complaint no attention should have been paid. This was a matter into which the bishop, it was argued, ought to have inquired judicially, but the terms of the Church Discipline Act (3 & 4 Vict. c. 86), s. 3, have only to be read, and the reader will see the futility of the argument. By that section it is enacted that it shall be lawful for the bishop "on the application of any party complaining" of an offence against the laws ecclesiastical, or "if he shall think fit of his own mere motion," to issue a commission of inquiry. It is obvious that if the bishop may himself, of his own accord, issue a commission, *a fortiori* he may do so, should he think fit, upon the application of a third party. Indeed the Lord Chancellor doubted whether the bishop would not be bound, in any event, to issue a commission upon an application made by any body charging an ecclesiastical offence. Certainly, the bishop has no more power to inquire into the religious opinions of the applicant than to inquire into his position in the world, or the colour of his hair. The words of the statute are express. "Any party" may complain, and who the party may be, what his position is, or what his creed, or how his costs

are to be paid, is absolutely immaterial, provided he complains of an offence against the laws of the church. Possibly the bishop might refuse the commission if the applicant was an improper person; but there is nothing in the statute to warrant the notion that the accused clergyman is entitled to be heard upon the question whether the applicant was a fit person or not. In other words, the bishop may perhaps have a *personal* discretion whether he will issue the commission or not; but he is not bound to exercise a *judicial* discretion. Indeed we do not see how he could exercise it. The Church Discipline Act, section 4, contemplates the summoning of witnesses and their examination upon oath before the commission when issued; but we can find no power given to the bishop to summon or to swear witnesses before the commission is issued. It would, therefore, appear that if the bishop were to hold a judicial inquiry before issuing the commission he would do an illegal act; and further, if he were to take upon himself to administer an oath to a witness upon such an inquiry, he would be committing a criminal offence. He would be administering an extra-judicial oath, and would be liable to an indictment under 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, s. 13 (see *Reg. v. Nott*, 1 Car. & M. 288).

We are glad that the Court of First Instance and Appeal summarily disposed of Dr. Stephen's application. The proceedings in an ecclesiastical suit are already clumsy and cumbrous enough. In each case there can be, and there often are, four separate inquiries. First the commission appointed by the bishop, acting upon sworn evidence taken in open court, make a report. Then the Consistorial Court hears the cause. Thence an appeal can be carried to the Arches Court, and from the Arches Court there is an appeal to the Privy Council. The Consistorial Court stage is indeed sometimes omitted, and the cause is at once sent by letters of request to the provincial tribunal. But even then, three inquiries remain. If Dr. Stephens had succeeded, these three or four stages, as the case may be, would have been increased by one more, and the difficulty of obtaining speedy justice in the Ecclesiastical Court, already formidable enough, would have been needlessly increased.

THE LETTER of our correspondent "Chancery-lane" draws attention to a subject of which but little is as yet known. There are rumours afloat of a proposal that all the orders of the Court of Chancery which deal with funds in the hands of the Paymaster-General shall be printed; that each such order shall contain a schedule of the payments to be made, or, at any rate, a tabular form in blank, with spaces for the amounts to be filled in when ascertained; that the original order, instead of being available for use as it is at present, shall be recorded by being filed; that a printed copy shall be allowed to be used; and that printed copies shall be lodged with the Paymaster-General and the Treasury. Under present arrangements it may be proper that the Treasury should be kept informed of all dealings with the funds in the Court of Chancery; but, with this exception, we are unable to see any very great advantages that will arise from the proposed alteration in practice, which, it is needless to observe, must, to some extent, increase the costs of obtaining payment out of court. No doubt, as a general rule, the printing of documents tends to convenience and accuracy. Persons, however, who have had experience in carrying orders, dealing with funds, through the Accountant-General or Pay-Master's Office, know how frequently corrections have to be made in orders after they are drawn up. The mere printing of the orders will not render such alterations unnecessary either in the original order or in the printed copies; and it is tolerably clear that, unless the printing is deferred until after the Paymaster-General has expressed himself satisfied with the order, no printed copy can be relied on as accurately representing the actual state of the order, until it has been compared with the original. It does

not appear to be contemplated that the printing will be put off to this stage of the proceedings; and this being so, it might be advisable to append to every print of an order a memorandum warning its reader not to rely on its being in the exact form in which it will be acted upon. Our correspondent seems to be of opinion that the printing of orders may possibly lead to fraud, but there can be little doubt that if the proposed change is made some mode of marking one of the copies will be adopted with the view of making it the only copy of which the Paymaster-General can take notice.

THE EXPRESSION "costs of all parties out of the fund" is one that is very familiar to readers of reports of cases in Chancery. The meaning of it, of course, is that a person, who either claimed what he was not entitled to or refused to accede to the just demand of others, is to be paid the costs occasioned to him by his untenable claim or refusal, out of the pockets of the persons whose property he claimed or whose just demands he resisted. At first sight nothing seems more monstrous than that such a thing should be tolerated, much less ordered, by a Court of Equity; but in the administration of estates and the distribution of funds so many questions of real difficulty arise that it is thought hard that a person should be fixed even with his own costs, merely because his view of the matter happened to be the *proxima causa* of the difficulty being brought before the Court for solution. It is clear, however, that the practice of making the fund pay for all comers is one that needs careful watching lest it should grow into a great evil, by fostering shadowy claims, and promoting idle litigation. Indeed, the whole system of awarding costs in Chancery is one that is always tending to abuse; and it has not been infrequent for judges to declare, and we may well believe that it has been still more frequent for judges inwardly to resolve, that they will strive to adhere as closely as possible—that is to say, far more closely than any of their predecessors or contemporaries—to the only reasonable rule, that, namely, which makes the unsuccessful party pay all the costs. It appears from one of our daily contemporaries that the new Master of the Rolls has been making a good resolution of this kind, and, moreover, registering it in the presence of the Bar. In future the sinister expression, "costs of all parties out of the fund," will rarely be heard at the Rolls, "whatever the practice obtaining in other quarters." We hope that in the case of Sir George Jessel neither the effects of a long practice at the Equity Bar, involving, as it must have done, almost innumerable applications for a slice of the fund, nor the apparently, in this respect, relaxing air of the Chancery Bench will gradually cause him to forget the good resolution he has this week made and published.

THE CASE of *Beall v. Smith*, which will be found in this week's issue of the *Weekly Reporter*, contains a full discussion by the Lords Justices on the power of the Court of Chancery to deal with the estates of persons of unsound mind both before and after inquisition, on the protection which orders of the Court obtained by next friends affords to them, and generally on the duties and liabilities of persons voluntarily instituting suits on behalf of infants and lunatics. Such persons must, of course, act solely for the benefit of those whose self-constituted guardians they are; and if, after orders have been made at their instance, the infant arriving at his majority, or the lunatic becoming capable to act by himself or a committee, can show the Court that such orders were not for his benefit, he will be recouped the costs his estate may have incurred, at the expense of his next friend. And it seems from the recent case that if the Court is of opinion that the suit is in fact the suit of the solicitor for the next friend, it may order the solicitor, and not the next friend, to make the necessary restitution.

From a perusal of the judgment in the case to which we have referred it will be seen that the Lords Justices

are by no means desirous of allowing their jurisdiction in lunacy to be trenchoned on by Courts of Equity; and that they express a clear opinion that once a person has been found of unsound mind by inquisition, as well before as after the appointment of a committee, the Court of Chancery has absolutely no power to deal with any of the lunatic's property or affairs.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

It has been announced that although one Commissioner will attend daily at the office, the Railway Commissioners will not "further sit to hear summonses for some time." The new Act has been in operation for nearly four months; the general orders and all other accessories have long been ready; two solitary "applications" have been reported at full length in the newspapers; but this is all the grist that is brought to the mill. So that there would seem to be a kind of freezing out of our Railway Commissioners; why or wherefore, it is hard to say. Is it that our great monopoly has suddenly turned good, and has so busied itself with providing "reasonable facilities" to everybody all round, that there has been nothing to complain of? Or is it that the anti-railway party, which has been gaining in strength of late years, is determined to have nothing to do with a Court which, by a firm administration and with occasional legislative assistance, might eventually frustrate any scheme of State purchase? Is it that the passenger public cannot combine to fight a railway company, and that the commercial public fear the expense? Lastly (which is the question of chief interest to the lawyer), is it that the decisions of the Court of Common Pleas under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854, are so clear and uniform, and so certain to be followed by the Commissioners, that railway grievances do not need the authority of the new Railway Court to settle them? We propose to say a word or two on the Common Pleas decisions presently, but it will be well first to trace briefly the manner in which the jurisdiction of that Court arose.

It was the late Lord Shaftesbury, in 1842, who first introduced the "equality clause" into a railway Act. The clause soon became a common form, and took its place in the Consolidation Act of 1845 (see section 90) as a matter of course. It comes by way of proviso to the power enabling the companies to vary their tolls, enacting simply that "all such tolls be at all times charged equally to all persons . . . passing over the same portion of the line of railway under the same circumstances." The ensuing litigation was peculiar. It was almost entirely confined to one class of litigants—the carriers, such as Messrs. Pickford—with whom the railway companies came into direct competition; the bone of contention was almost invariably the "packed parcel," and the railway companies fought with unexampled pertinacity. Thus we find Willes, J., saying, in *Piddington v. South Eastern Railway Company* (5 C. B. N. S. 111, 121), "It is clear upon the whole facts of the case that the increased charge is made for the purpose of preventing people who are likely to send packages of the description in question" (packed parcels), "viz., carriers, from entering into competition with the company in the conveyance of goods—a thing which it has over and over again been decided that the companies cannot be permitted to do." Those who care to examine this class of cases fully cannot do better than refer to the opinion of Blackburn, J., in the House of Lords case of *Great Western Railway Company v. Sutton* (L. R. 4 H. L. 226), where the equality clause and the cases upon it are treated in a manner completely exhaustive, the pith of the opinion being that the "equality clause imposes upon the companies acting as carriers a liability beyond what is imposed at common law, so that an unequal charge to different persons is by virtue of the statute extortionate." However, it was probably owing as much to the numerous amalgamation schemes of the time as

to the comparative ill success of the equality clause, that Mr. Cardwell came forward with the bill of 1854. This, the second and chief section of which passed word for word as it was introduced, enacted that the companies should (1) give reasonable facilities in aid of their own traffic, (2) abstain from giving preference to one customer above another, and (3) give reasonable facilities in aid of their through traffic. The debates on the bill are of no small interest. Mr. Cardwell is reported to have made the remarkable statement that, except in its third branch, the bill imposed no greater liability on the companies than that imposed upon carriers at common law, while Lord Campbell (who struggled hard against the judges being made, as he termed it, railway directors) volunteered the opinion, not without its use at the present day, when so many people are asking what the Railway Commissioners have the power to do, that the bill would empower the judges to decide how many trains should start, what should be the number of carriages, and lastly (an opinion which we commend to the notice of Mr. Forsyth), whether time was properly kept. Lord Lyndhurst severely criticised the vagueness of the 2nd section, and with his own hand added that model of clearness, the 7th, relating to special contracts.

We come now to the decisions under the Act. To borrow the language of Marshal Bugeaud as to the English infantry, the cases, from their length and complexity, are the most terrible in the books, but happily there are not many of them. The first thing to be noticed with regard to them is that, with one or two exceptions, they are almost entirely confined to questions of undue preference. This is easily explained. There is a definiteness in the charge of undue preference which the charge of absolutely withholding reasonable facilities does not present. It is comparatively easy to say whether customer A is preferred to customer B. It is very hard to say whether traffic facilities are unreasonably withheld from all customers alike. Thus in the early and important case of *Caterham Railway Company v. London and Brighton Railway Company* (1 C. B. N. S. 410, 5 W. R. C. L. Dig. 229), where the complaints were that too few trains stopped at Caterham Junction, and that third class return tickets were not granted to Caterham, we find the judges grounding their refusal of a rule on these points on the fact that Caterham was treated upon an equality with stations of a similar character. Another noticeable feature of the cases is the frequency with which the same names recur. The name of Ransome appears four times, Oxlade twice, Baxendale six times, and so on. The conflict of judicial opinion as to how far the question of competition between traders might be entertained is also remarkable. "The question of competition," said Erie C. J., in the last of Mr. Ransome's cases (8 C. B. N. S. 709), "is not one that the Court can entertain." "The company," said Montague Smith, J., in *Palmer v. London Brighton and South Coast Railway Company* (19 W. R. 627, L. R. 6 C. P. 194), "must act fairly, and so as not to exclude competition." It is somewhat surprising to find the Court equally divided upon the important question whether its own decisions were binding as precedents or not (*Palmer v. London and South Western Railway Company*, 15 W. R. 11, L. R. 1 C. P. 588).

If we except the cases upon passenger traffic (which are only four in number), the cases upon the traffic in coal are those which most deeply affected the interests of the public. That railway companies are not common carriers of coal is, we believe, beyond question, since the two cases of *Palmer v. Grand Junction Railway Company* (4 M. & W. 749) and *Johnson v. Midland Railway Company* (4 Ex. 367), but whether the peculiar jurisdiction conferred by the Railway and Canal Traffic Act will not extend to compel them to carry coal wherever it is thought by the administrators of the Act reasonable that they should do so, is a question which we cannot but think was not sufficiently discussed in the case of *Oxlade v. North Eastern Railway Company*.

(1 C. B. N. S. 454, 5 W. R. C. L. Dig. 230). In that case the Court simply waited for and accepted the decision of the Court of Exchequer in the contemporaneous case of *Johnson v. Midland Railway Company*, without considering whether the statute under which they acted did not take the case out of the common law altogether. Nor can we regard with satisfaction (though the question was rather one of administration than of law) the decision in *Oxlade v. North Eastern Railway Company* (15 C. B. N. S. 680), where the Court held that the company were justified in refusing to carry coal except for colliery owners only. The decision tends so much to favouring that monopoly which it was the very object of the statute to prevent, and a monopoly, too, of one of the necessities of life, that it is hardly one which our present Railway Commissioners would choose to follow.

To pass to the question of through traffic—the securing “freedom and economy of transit from one end of the kingdom to the other”; this branch of the Act was sought to be put in force almost immediately after its passing, in *Barret v. Great Northern and Midland Railway Companies* (1 C. B. N. S. 423, 5 W. R. C. L. Dig. 229.) That particular application, which was to compel the two companies to run corresponding trains, failed, and deservedly, because the applicant could not make out a public inconvenience. It was the first and last application of the kind. The new Act has now added an important provision as to through rates, and it will be interesting to see whether canal companies will avail themselves of their new power to make through rates over the line of every railway company. Should this be done in any large measure, and should canal companies at the same time avail themselves of the provisions of 8 & 9 Vict. c. 42 (passed in order to obtain “greater competition for the public advantage”), whereby canal companies are enabled to become common carriers, canals may be enabled to regain some of their pristine importance. Such were the speculations of the committee upon whose report the Act was founded. But as yet the canal companies do not seem to have awoken to the conception of any such glorious future; at any rate they have not hitherto invoked the aid of the Railway Commissioners to help them to achieve it.

“STIRPITAL CONSTRUCTION.”

It constantly happens that persons who, without sufficient knowledge, undertake to draw legal instruments, fail to realise completely the scheme of events with which they are dealing, and consequently leave many cases unprovided for. The events which a will contemplates are generally more numerous, more involved, and less matters of course than those which come within the scope of a settlement. Yet, owing to a fallacious application of the rule that in wills the intention is more considered than in deeds, wills much more often than settlements are drawn by unskilled hands. But the numerous cases upon will construction show how many unseen ambiguities frequently lurk under words which, to a non-professional mind, appear the simplest and most intelligible. Cases which depend upon expressions relating to time, such as “then living,” or “survivor,” are good illustrations of this. The latter term is frequently used where it is clear that the testator, if he had had its full effect explained, would have adopted a different mode of expression; and in some cases a definite intention is evinced by the language of the will, which the simple substitution of the word “other” for “survivor” completely carries out. The rules which determine when this substitution may be considered as made form a distinct chapter of the law of will construction. So inveterate is the tendency of hasty or careless draftsmen to misuse the term “survivor,” that Sir William Grant, in *Barlow v. Salter* (17 Ves. 479, 482), seems to have considered that whenever it was used the presumption was that “other” was intended. But this excess of benevolence towards inaccurate testators was

afterwards corrected, and in later cases a tendency is observable to adhere more strictly to the primary meaning of words of survivorship. Of this *Browne v. Bainsford* (16 W. R. 198, Ir. Rep. 1 Eq. 384) is an instance.

In cases such as we are considering, it has been usual to say that the testator used “survivor” instead of “other”; and in *Badger v. Gregory* (17 W. R. 1090, L. R. 8 Eq. 78), James, V.C., thought that this habitual misuse of the term was a circumstance which ought to influence the mind of the judge in construing a will, just as all would come to the consideration of any document in which the word “premises” occurs “with a perfect certainty that its proper legal meaning is not the meaning which it has in the vernacular of lessors, lessees, and house-agents.”

But in *Waite v. Littlewood* (21 W. R. 131, L. R. 8 Ch. 70), and in the recent case of *Cooper v. Macdonald* (21 W. R. 833, L. R. 16 Eq. 258), Lord Selborne pointed out that in many cases it is not entirely true to say that testators used “survivor” as simply equivalent to “other,” and without any reference to its proper signification. “Generally speaking, a reason of some kind may be found for the use of the word ‘survivor’ where it occurs, though it may very possibly be, and often in these cases is, an imperfect expression, not expressing completely and exhaustively the whole intention” (L. R. 8 Ch. 74). In *Cooper v. Macdonald* (*ubi sup.*) a similar difficulty arose upon the words “then living.” The testator made specific devises for the benefit of each of his children. The limitations were identical, and were in effect as follows:—“To A. for life, with remainder to A.’s children as tenants in tail, with cross-remainders between them as to both original and accruing shares, “and failing such issue of A., in trust for my other children equally, and the heirs of their respective bodies as tenants in common, or if there be only one of my said children then living, in trust for that child only and the heirs of his or her body.” Lord Selborne, sitting for the Master of the Rolls, held that the adverb “then” referred to the words “failing such issue,” and that the qualification “then living” was a condition which, upon the failure of A.’s issue, the other children must satisfy, whether there were several or only one. The problem, therefore, now became to interpret the expression, “failing such issue of A. in trust for my other children equally, if then living, and the heirs of their respective bodies.” Observing, then, that the scheme of the will is to provide not only for the children individually, but for them and their descendants—in other words, that the stirps of which each child was the root, not the root alone, was the object of the testator’s contemplation, his Lordship concluded that the words “then living” must receive what he called a stirpital construction, so that the gift would have to be read thus:—“Failing such issue of A., in trust for my other children who, or the heirs of whose bodies, may be then living, equally, and the heirs of their respective bodies.” This mode of interpretation Lord Selborne intimated was applicable to the word “survivor” in many of the cases where it was commonly, but inaccurately, said that “survivor” was used instead of “other.” There seems much common sense, as well as much ingenuity, in Lord Selborne’s suggestion, and the term “stirpital construction” undoubtedly serves to mark out a special class of the cases in which words having reference to the duration of life are used. But the principle which he lays down will require to be criticised by the light of subsequent cases before unreserved adhesion can be given to it.

Mr. John Alderson Foote, B.A., has been elected M’Mahon Student in Law at St. John’s College, Cambridge. The studentship is of the value of £150 per annum, and is tenable for four years. Mr. Foote is a scholar of St. John’s, and took a first class in the Classical Tripos, 1872. He was also Chancellor’s Medallist for Legal Studies, and is Senior Scholar in International Law on Dr. Whewell’s foundation.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

WILL—MULTIPLICATION OF CHARGES.

Cooper v. Macdonald, L.C. for M.R., 21 W. R. 833, L. R. 16 Eq. 258.

In addition to the question above discussed, another point of some interest to conveyancers arose in this case. Where two estates or funds are settled upon the same person, and the disposition affecting the last given is declared by reference to the first given, it is a general rule that charges are not to be multiplied. Thus, if Whiteacre be settled upon A. for life, with remainder to his children in strict settlement, subject to a charge of £100 a-year in favour of A.'s widow; and in a subsequent part of the instrument it is declared that Blackacre shall be subject to the same limitations as are expressed concerning Whiteacre, the charge of £100 a-year will not be considered as repeated in the limitations of Blackacre, so that A.'s widow will have a jointure of £100, not of £200. The rule, being one of construction, is not invariable, and in the recent case it was held that it does not apply where the charge is of a fractional part of the income, or where there is a power to make a charge not exceeding a given fraction. Thus, if A.'s widow took one-third of the income of Whiteacre, she would also take one-third of the income arising from Blackacre. The rule and the exception probably in most cases accord with the real intention of the disposer. But as there is nothing which calls for greater care on the draftsman's part than the mode of framing referential dispositions, it is well to take notice of the inferences which will be drawn in the absence of express provision.

ADMIRALTY.

SALVAGE.

The "Melpomene", Adm., 21 W. R. 956.

The principle here laid down is novel. It is held that "where a vessel makes signals of distress, and another goes out with the *bona fide* intention of assisting that distress, and, as far as she can, does so, and some accident occurs which prevents her services being as effectual as she intended them to be, and no blame attaches to her, she ought not to go wholly unrewarded." We are glad to observe that the learned judge in awarding salvage on this ground, carefully limits the rule thus introduced to the description (in general terms) of the very circumstances of the case before him, so as not even to give to the decision the appearance of an authority for any wider proposition. It should be noticed that the provision of the 18th section of the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act, of last session (36 & 37 Vict. c. 85), must not be confounded with the effect of this decision. That section, which makes the master of a vessel liable for compensation for labour, risk, or loss, done and sustained in consequence of his signals being supposed to be signals of distress, is limited to the case of distress signals being used in a case where the vessel is not in distress.

REVIEWS.

Blackstone Economised, being a Compendium of the Laws of England to the Present Time. By DAVID MITCHELL AIRD, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Longmans, Green & Co.

The issue of a new edition of this work within less than a year sufficiently indicates that its merits have been appreciated by the public, and as Mr. Aird does not appear to have made any material alteration or addition, it is not necessary for us to add anything to the remarks we made upon the work when it first appeared.

NOTES.

A correspondent of the *Times*, referring to the scheme in preparation by the Italian Minister of Justice for modifying the code, chiefly with a view to simplify and cheapen the proceedings in criminal cases, and to shorten the unconscionable period of *carcere preventivo*, or imprisonment before trial, says that it is to be presumed something will also be done towards reforming the institution of the jury. The Italians, it seems, have too tender hearts to sit in judgment on their erring brethren. The leniency of the jury, excessive in all cases, is carried to absurd extremes when the political propensities of the twelve men in the box come into play. A tax-gatherer at Naples absconded with a sum of the public money amounting to more than one million francs. It was pleaded that the money he had embezzled was, after all, the people's money, "the people's blood," drained from the people's veins by a tyrannical Government. The tax-gatherer was himself one of the people, and what belonged to them all was thus simply appropriated for the benefit of one of them. The tax-gatherer was unanimously acquitted. In another instance the uppermost feeling of the jury was hatred of the Church and of all religion. A miscreant had fired a gun at random into a church, and hit in the leg a gentleman who was there at his devotions. "If," the jury reasoned, "the gentleman had not been at church; if he had not been a besotted bigot grovelling in the most abject superstition, his leg would not have found itself in the way of the bullet." The fault is evidently his, not of the bullet, of the gun, or of the man who fired it. The jury, ironically remarks an Italian journal, "could do no less than acquit the prisoner, and they deserve credit for discretion and forbearance in not having actually convicted the gentleman of obstruction of a free-thinker's free bullet."

We learn from the *Albany Law Journal* that Dr. Woolsey recently took occasion, in the course of his lecture on international law, to the Yale law class, to give his views of the *Virginus* affair. He looked upon it as an extreme case, which the ordinary law of nations does not meet. The offence was not piracy, for there was no *animus furandi*. It was not breach of blockade, for there was no blockade. It was not technically carrying contraband of war, for there was not, technically, any war. The vessel, although nominally American, seems to have belonged to Cubans. The concluding remarks were as follows: "You will see that this is in some respects a peculiar case. There is no war in Cuba, and yet there is war. The *Virginus* was an American vessel, and yet not an American vessel. All the defences of the vessel rested on a sham, and the state of things in Cuba was in one sense a sham. The only reality about the matter was the terrible one that broke through the sham that said 'This vessel means war, and we mean to take it for what it is. Would you have us give up our right of self-defence against war for a sham?' There is a conflict in the case between unjust law and unlawful justice. A weak nation must be very careful how it breaks through the fine network of what is lawful; but a strong nation will do it and take the consequences. Suppose a part of Ireland to be in a state of armed insurrection, and an American vessel to be engaged in carrying from some port in Spain important Irish leaders, as well as ammunition and money, does any one believe for a moment that the Government of Great Britain would hesitate to arrest the vessel before it had got into British waters, when there was great risk that a half-extinguished rebellion would be lighted up again by the arrival of the new means of war and the new sympathisers? I impute more solid sense to Great Britain."

From the return furnished by direction of the Vice-Chancellor of the Lancaster Chancery Court, for the year 1872, we learn that the number of suits and matters originated at Liverpool was 55 by bill, 14 by claim, 34 by summons, 41 special case petitions, &c.; 30 interrogatories were filed, 35 answers and other defences. Of causes and original matters on motions for decrees, &c., there were three awaiting at the commencement of the year, 90 set down, 91 heard, and two were awaiting at the end. The

amount paid or transferred into court was—stock £96,592 7s.; and cash, £118,937. The amount paid out of court was—stock, £24,672 17s. 6d.; and cash £146,480 17s. 7d. The number of suits and matters originated at Preston was by bill, 15; by claim, one; summons, seven; special petition, 18; interrogatories filed, nine; answers and other defences, four. Number of causes and original matters on motions, &c., set down during the year, 24; of these 23 were heard. A sum of £2,975 2s. of stock and £9,116 15s. 8d. of cash was paid or transferred into court, and £5,859 2s. 1d. of stock and £7,921 12s. 4d. was paid out of court. At Manchester the number of suits and matters originated was 68 by bill, 9 by claim, 13 by summons, 45 by special case petitions, &c.; 37 interrogatories were filed, 22 answers and other defences. Of causes and original matters on motions for decrees, &c., 112 were set down during the year and heard. The amount paid or transferred into court was—stock, £3,150 7s. 10d.; and cash, £77,187 3s. 6d.; and the amount paid out of court, £82,307 0s. 6d.

On Wednesday last the Master of the Rolls had before him a special case of *Waring v. Currey*, which was filed for the purpose of settling the construction of a will. In the course of the argument his Honour expressed his disapprobation of the citation of several cases, saying that cases ought not to be cited on a question of construction unless they explained the meaning of technical terms or laid down general principles. In giving judgment his Honour repeated these observations, and read a passage from the judgment of Lord Wensleydale in *Grey v. Pearson*, 5 W. R. 454, 6 H. L. C. 106, where the same rule is stated. His Honour said that he wished to call attention to this point, because this rule had come to be generally neglected by counsel in practice, and was not acted on with sufficient strictness by the judges of the Court of Chancery. The judge had merely to look at the whole of the testator's will, and endeavour to put upon it the construction which the testator appeared to have intended.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW SCALE OF COMMISSION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I much regret I did not before to-day notice the letter of "L. G. B." in your journal of the 15th inst.

"L. G. B." asks me to explain particularly the charges I would desire to see sanctioned. In reply, I say I cordially approve of the good sense and justice shown by the committee in their first circular—leave transactions under £500 to be ruled by the circumstances of the cases, the business needful, which is often of a large amount. One would think that the competition to which respectable members of the profession are subjected by disreputable members, coupled with the humiliation of our bills being subject to taxation, accompanied by various unfair rules, would be considered a sufficient protection to the public, without such a scale of payment in small matters being even mentioned, much less enforced. Or provide that in matters under £500 the operation of the scale shall be confined exclusively to the simple preparation of the deed, and not be allowed to include any kind of incidental business, or any journeys. "L. G. B.'s" letter is to the purpose; some of the other letters of your correspondents puzzle me more; one, for instance, alludes to the fees paid to solicitors for building societies; but do not these solicitors enjoy a monopoly of all the business done by such societies? As for what I charge for a mortgage of £100, or a little over, I try for from £4 to £5, in cases (almost all of them) in which I have not only to do the professional business but to get the money; and I hope the committee will not take away from me the option of refusing to do the work if I cannot get as well paid as that comes to. Having treated of small transactions I turn to large ones, and my opinion of the proposed scale is that it is as unfair to the public in the large as it is to the profession in the small ones. "L. G. B.," in his letter inserted on 29th November, has given you one case; I give another: that of a purchase, value £4,400. The charges on the present system are £50. By the proposed scale they would amount

to £111, the solicitor acting for vendor as well as purchaser; and in this very bill (not one of my own) the charges for a mortgage of £150 are £5 9s. 1d., being about similar to my own. No doubt the committee have a knot to untie which is a most complicated one; but if they cannot untie it they have no business to cut it; they have "put their foot in it," and had better "hark back," at least, so I think.

Dec. 8. A SOLICITOR OF THIRTY YEARS' STANDING.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Your correspondent "L. G. B." in your journal of the 15th ult. states his disbelief that the Legislature would sanction a larger charge than that laid down by the Incorporated Society for the loan of £100, and adds his own opinion that they ought not. Why? He goes on to complain that your correspondent, "A Solicitor of Thirty Years' Standing" does not state what his charge usually is. I, therefore, will ask you to oblige me by inserting the following letters which I have forwarded to a distinguished member of the Incorporated Law Society—and shall be obliged if "L. G. B." will inform me through your paper what in his opinion my charges ought to be. There is a great deal of fuss made now-a-days about remuneration for skill. I think it will be found in practice there is far more skill displayed in avoiding unnecessary work in small matters than in the larger transactions, and if anything like the scale proposed by the society for larger transactions is to be adopted, the remuneration far outbalances the labour and responsibility; whilst the smaller matters, though of equal importance and in many cases of far greater importance—inasmuch as a defective title in the latter case will plunge the small purchaser or lender in utter ruin—would not remunerate a law stationer.

Of course, in the correspondence, I have omitted names and places. I have such an utter detestation of all anonymous scribbling that at the risk of being considered presumptuous I subscribe myself,

H. B. B. MASON.

Wreham, Norfolk, Dec. 9.

18th November, 1873.

Dear Sir,—I write you, as an influential member of the Incorporated Law Society, in consequence of a scale of charges I received yesterday. If the society are really to endeavour to make these charges compulsory it is very difficult to write with any degree of temper on the subject. I shall be obliged if you will inform me, first, what is the meaning of "and in addition." Is it that we are to count £1 per cent. and £2 per cent. respectively over again on the first £100 up to £2,000 or £1,000? I suppose not. In very many cases the mortgagee's solicitor is also the mortgagee's. Are the charges cumulative?

It is quite clear that in the majority of conveyances our remuneration will be but little above stationers' charges. I see it is to include all travelling in England, and, so that we do not cross the water, it is of no moment how many days we are necessarily absent from our office, whether for examining deeds or settling purchase. No distinction is made whether the purchase is freehold or copyhold or whether it embraces both. Instance: Client purchased one lot of £1,300 of the W. estates (a title formerly well known to you); there were upwards of four hundred sheets of abstract, and a supplemental abstract of fifty sheets. Myself and four other solicitors were five days in London examining deeds, and worked from ten till five each day, leaving off on the Saturday just two hours before the train started to bring us home. My deed was necessarily eleven skins, counsel's requisitions sixty folios, further requisitions thirty folios, epitome of title one hundred and fifty-one folios. We agreed together to lay one abstract before counsel at, I think, forty guineas, with a condition that he should prepare all the drafts, charging from five guineas to one guinea; and according to the scale your society lay down, I should be entitled to only £33 for my work and labour.

Suppose my client built a mansion on his purchase and made it worth £5,000, and the title became defective, ought the "gentleman, one, &c.," to be placed in such a position for so paltry a remuneration?

On the other side, a client bought a portion of Lord —'s Estate, purchase-money £11,100. I was very well remunerated by his cheque for sixty guineas, exclusive of stamps and travelling charges; the same with

another different title, purchase-money £6,500. According to your scale I see my fee would have been £173; perfectly preposterous, and for the £6,500, £125, equally preposterous for the work and labour done. Pray enlighten me on this, as there is something very wrong which requires to be set right.—I am, Dear Sir, Yours faithfully,
To ———, Esq. H. B. B. MASON.

Wexham, Brandon, Nov. 19, 1873.

Conveyancing—Law Costs.

Dear Sir,—I did not in my yesterday's remarks allude to the sales. Is £3 to be considered sufficient for all sales by auction and by private contract? Handbills, conditions, and perhaps travel-distances from one to seven miles to a small alehouse and sit there till seven, eight or nine o'clock, p.m., &c., &c. I conveyed an estate the other day, freehold and copyhold, purchase-money £170, abstract 26 sheets; the deeds belonged to the mortgagee, the vendor's solicitor in ———. I travelled six miles to settle and examine deeds (through the solicitor agreeing to meet there, having other business, and bringing the deeds with him, or I must have employed an agent in the city). The court-rolls were at Lynn; for this the fee, according to the scale, would be £6. I should add the freeholds were in two titles, and not having the deeds, &c., included deed of covenant for production by a third party; but why give instances which could be multiplied by hundreds? If the society hope by publication of non-remunerative sums for small transactions, and most preposterous sums for large ones, to stave off wholesale destruction by legislation, I cannot but consider that they act with very short-sighted policy, and their enemies will use their own weapons against them. A radical change will take place doubtless, and your society will not avert it by doing a gross injustice to those practitioners whose fortuitous circumstances have not placed them surrounded with clients who only deal in four figures with the larger unit, and in such a condition that they can afford to say to the humble purchaser or borrower of three figures, "My good sir, I cannot attend to you, but there is a very respectable practitioner at the bottom of the street, he will do it for you, you are quite safe in his hands."

I am old enough to remember the years preceding the Tithe Act; most rectors dreading the days of peril acted liberally to the payer, save one, shrewder than the rest, who wisely raised his claim to the utmost stretch, observing whatever change takes place it will "not be in favour of the parson." The prudence of the move was soon apparent by its heightening the averages.—I am, Dear Sir, yours faithfully
To ———, Esq. H. B. B. MASON.

Pray excuse my omitting to mention the charges for sales yesterday, which has occasioned me to trouble you with two letters.

[We print these letters, as it is very important that the subject should be freely discussed; but we must appeal to our correspondents to be more brief.—ED. S. J.]

BEDFORD LEVEL ACTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—If your correspondent G. J. will consult "Wells' on the Bedford Level," published 1830, and the Index to the Statutes, Part 2, Local and Personal, &c., compiled by order of the Select Committee on the Library of the House of Lords, and ordered to be printed 19th August, 1867 (353), p. 102, under the head "Bedford Level," I think he will find what he wants, i.e., so far as that Index comes down; or Raithby's Index to the Statutes, under the head "Bedford Level," may perhaps supply the want of Wells' book. A SUBSCRIBER.

[With reference to a note enclosed by our correspondent, it is scarcely necessary to point out that the case referred to was mentioned merely as an illustration of the difficulty alluded to, and not as an authority.—ED. S. J.]

ORDERS DEALING WITH FUNDS IN COURT.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It is stated that in future, commencing in Hilary Term, 1874, all the orders of the Court of Chancery which deal with funds in court are to be printed; that the original order, as passed by the registrar, is to be filed of record, and that we are to work upon a printed copy. In

the abstract the printing of orders is undoubtedly a step in the right direction, but the many inconveniences of such a process appear to me to far outweigh its usefulness, and I cannot but think that in compelling parties to work with a printed copy instead of with the original, a door is opened for fraud and improper dealing which the promoters of this scheme can never have contemplated.

CHANCERY LANE.

COURTS.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHE, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Nov. 18.—*Re Taylor.*

T. having presented a petition under the 125th and 126th sections of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, the creditors at the first meeting resolved to accept a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, by two instalments, and a trustee was appointed for payment, and at the second meeting the creditors confirmed the resolution, and the same was duly registered. The name of W., a secured creditor appeared in the list presented at the first meeting. When the composition became payable the trustee wrote to W. informing him of the fact and requesting him to prove his debt, so that the composition might be paid upon the unsecured balance. W. did not comply with this request, but brought an action for the recovery of his whole demand.

Upon application being made for an injunction to stay the action,

Held, that T. was entitled to an injunction; the trustee to pay to W. the amount of the composition.

This was an application on behalf of a liquidating debtor for an order to restrain proceedings at law commenced by Michael Waterer, a creditor.

In July, 1872, the debtor filed a petition under the 125th and 126th sections of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and at the first meeting of his creditors a resolution was passed for the acceptance of a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, and a trustee was appointed for payment. The resolution was duly confirmed at the second meeting of creditors and duly registered. By the terms of the resolution the composition was payable to the creditors by equal instalments on the 1st October and the 1st November, and it was in fact paid to all except Waterer, a creditor for about £200, who held security in the form of a policy of assurance. The debtor in his affidavit stated that the trustee not knowing the amount at which Waterer valued his security was unable to pay the composition to him, and on the 7th November the trustee wrote as follows:—

"I beg to inform you that I am now paying the composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound to those creditors of the debtor who have proved their claims, and shall feel obliged by your furnishing me with the statutory proof of your claim without delay, in order that I may disburse the amount due to you."

To that letter a reply was written by Messrs. Harper & Co., the solicitors for Waterer, in which they inquired whether the trustee had received any and what composition or instalments from Taylor in respect of the debt shown to be due to Waterer in the statement produced at the meeting of creditors, and in reply an account was furnished by the trustee showing that a sum of £220 had been received.

Some further correspondence ensued, and the trustee wrote, "I have every reason to suppose that the funds in my hands will enable me to send you by return of post a warrant for the payment of the composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, assuming the claim to be admitted by Mr. Taylor."

The trustee stated that the moneys placed in his hands were estimated to be equal to the payment of the composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound on the whole of the unsecured debts, and that he was ready and willing to pay the composition. Waterer had recently brought an action against the debtor for the recovery of £239 11s. 9d., being the full amount of his debt with interest.

Winslow in support of the application.—The present case calls for the interference of the Court. In *Edwards v. Chombe*, 21 W. R. 107, L. R. 7 C. P. 519, Willes, J., admitted the right of this Court to exercise its jurisdiction. In *Ex parte Hodge, Re Hatton*, 20 W. R. 978, L. R. 7 Ch. 723, James, L.J., said there might be cases in which, to prevent injustice, the Court of Bankruptcy would interfere. And the same principle was recognised in *Ex parte Pascock, Re*

Duffield, 21 W. R. 755, L. R. 8 Ch. 682. Supposing there had been an assignment to a trustee, the Court would not have allowed any creditor to bring an action against the debtor. The trustee believed that it would be necessary for Mr. Waterer to prove his debt, and said, in effect, "Assess the value of your security and I will pay you."

Doria, for Mr. Waterer.—The question was whether the debtor by the course adopted had brought himself within the saving clause in *Edwards v. Coombe*. The creditors did not accept the agreement to pay in satisfaction but the composition itself, and the amount should be paid within a reasonable time. The debtor had not acted in good faith. Default having been made in payment of the composition, the creditors were remitted to their original rights.

ROCHE, Registrar.—The question in this case is of a very simple character. The authorities show, no doubt, that if default be made in payment of the composition, the debts of the creditors revive, but the correspondence in this case, commencing on the 7th November, proves that the debtor tried to pay the debt, and that an application was made to the creditor to value his security, which he did not do. "He that seeks equity must do equity." If he had said "The policy is of no value, or the value is so much," he would have received the composition upon the balance. There is no pretence for bringing the action, and the injunction must be granted; the creditor to be at liberty to add to his debt the amount of extra costs consequent upon the debtor not making earlier application to this Court; and the trustee to pay the composition. I may add that I do not think it was incumbent on the trustee to tender the composition unless the value of the security had been deducted.

Solicitors for the debtor, *Townley & Gard*.

Solicitors for the creditor, *Harper, Broad, & Co.*

(Before the Hon. W. C. SPRING-RICE, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Nov. 22, 28.—*Ex parte Marley, Re Hathaway, Re Green*.

H., in December, 1872, recovered a judgment against *G.*, a trader, for £8,789, and in March, 1873, execution was issued, and on the 17th April the sheriff levied upon the goods of *G.* On the 22nd April the sheriff executed a deed poll, which included *G.*'s goods, to *H.*, and on the 30th *G.* presented a petition for liquidation, under which a trustee was appointed.

Held, that the deed constituted an act of bankruptcy within the 5th sub-section of section 6 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and that the transaction was not protected by the 3rd sub-section of the 95th section.

This was a motion by the trustee under the bankruptcy of Mr. Philip Hathaway, solicitor, Bedford-row, for an injunction restraining the trustee in liquidation of Green from dealing with certain goods in his possession as trustee, being goods described in a certain deed poll of the 22nd April last, and for a declaration that such deed poll was a valid assignment of such goods, and that the trustee of Green might be ordered to give up possession of such goods and for certain consequential directions.

In July, 1868, an agreement was entered into between Hathaway, then in practice as a solicitor, and Green, a paper manufacturer, the purport of which was that Hathaway was to make advances to Green to carry on his business, and in return should have the option of becoming a partner within seven years, receiving a third share of the profits.

Under this agreement large advances were made, amounting in the whole to about £14,000. In December, 1872, Hathaway recovered a judgment against Green for the sum of £8,798 6s. 8d., as was alleged by agreement between them, for the purpose of protecting Green's property, and no execution issued until the month of March following. The sheriff levied on 17th April, and on the 22nd executed the deed poll to Hathaway, under which the claim of the trustee of his estate was made. On the 30th April Green filed his petition for arrangement, and on the 20th of June a trustee was appointed. The sheriff had no notice of these proceedings. A petition in bankruptcy against Hathaway was filed on the 6th June, and an adjudication made on the 9th of July, the act of bankruptcy being his departure out of England. Hathaway had never appeared to his bankruptcy.

Roxburgh, Q.C., and *Ellis J. Davis*, for the motion.—The transaction is protected by section 95, sub-section 3; if not, it is impossible to construe that provision.

De Gex, Q.C., and *Winslow*, for the respondent.—We claim the goods on three grounds (1) that the assignment was a fraudulent preference within the meaning of section 92; (2) that, as the goods were not removed at the time of the filing of his petition by Green, they were in his order and disposition; (3) that the deed itself was an act of bankruptcy within the 5th sub-section, 6th section: *Ex parte Eyles, Re Edwards*, 21 W. R. 574.

Roxburgh, in reply.

Cur. adv. vult.

SPRING-RICE, Registrar.—In the view I take it is not necessary to go into the evidence to which reference was made in support of the first two grounds for impeaching the assignment, for I am clearly of opinion that the third objection to it must prevail. It was an act of bankruptcy by reason of the seizure and sale by the sheriff. I cannot accede to Mr. Roxburgh's argument that so to hold would render it impossible to construe the 3rd sub-section of the 95th section. That section I must take to refer to seizures and sales under £50. It seems to me clearly not to alter the plain meaning of the words of the 5th sub-section of section 6, nor do I think it possible that by the expression that fell from the chief judge in *Ex parte Eyles, Re Edwards* (*ubi sup.*), he meant it had such an effect, and it was certainly not necessary so to construe it in deciding that case.

The 87th section does not seem to me to have any bearing; that section cannot give the execution creditors a better title than he had under the deed poll, and as my decision is that that deed poll was an act of bankruptcy of which he had notice, he is without any title thereunder. The trustee of Hathaway's estate cannot therefore retain the goods against the trustee of Green's estate, and the motion must be refused with costs. Had it been necessary for me to decide the case on that ground, I incline to think that the evidence would have satisfied me that the action brought by Hathaway and the judgment and seizure and sale under it "was a judicial proceeding taken or suffered by a person unable to pay his debts in favour of a creditor" and therefore a fraudulent preference under the 92nd section.

Solicitors for the trustee of Hathaway's estate, *E. F. & B. Davis*.

Solicitors for the trustee of Green's estate, *Harper, Broad, & Co.*

COUNTY COURTS.

LIVERPOOL.

(Before Mr. PERRONET THOMPSON, Judge.)

Dec. 6.—*In re John Cross*.

Bankruptcy Act, 1869, s. 28.—*Notice of meeting*.

This was an application for the approval of the Court to a resolution of creditors at a meeting called under the 28th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, accepting a composition of fourpence in the pound.

Colton, on behalf of dissentient creditors, objected that the resolution had been passed at a meeting not duly convened. It was necessary that notice of the meeting should be given in the *Gazette* and one local newspaper ten days prior to it's being held; but in the present case the notice in the *Gazette* appeared only four days before the meeting.

Gill, in reply, said the practice was not imperative as to the length of notice to be given. In this very matter the Court had considered resolutions passed at a meeting which had only been advertised seven days. The main question to be considered was, had all the creditors been apprised of the meeting? The best proof of that was the fact that every creditor of the bankrupt, except one for a very small amount, was present or represented at the meeting. The only meeting which the rules required to be advertised ten days was that called by the registrar—namely, the first meeting of creditors; but all other meetings, even those called by the Court, under section 20, were to be summoned as the Court might direct, and, without such direction, by notice being sent to each creditor, as had been done here, stating the object of the meeting.

His HONOUR said that from the prescribed form of advertisement under section 28 it was clear that notice of the meeting must be advertised in the *London Gazette* and a local newspaper, and he understood the Chief Judge had so laid down the practice. The meeting, therefore, having to

be advertised in the *Gazette*, the only question was as to the length of notice to be given, and as in the case of other meetings called by advertisement in the *Gazette* ten days' notice was specified, he thought it would be a salutary practice to adopt here. If there was not some such rule, meetings might be called on the day on which the advertisement appeared, making the notice nugatory. With respect to the Court having on a former occasion considered resolutions passed at a meeting called by a seven days' notice, it was only done on Mr. Colton waiving his objection to the notice. In the present case he did not consider the resolutions had been passed at a meeting duly convened, and therefore he should decline to entertain them.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. FRANCIS SNOWDEN has been appointed Senior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlements. Mr. Snowden was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in Hilary Term, 1854, and has held the position of Senior Magistrate of the Court of Requests at Straits Settlements.

Mr. GEORGE PHILLIPPO has been appointed Junior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlements. Mr. Philippo was called to the bar in Hilary Term, 1862, having previously obtained a certificate of honour at the examination in January of that year. He has held the position of puisne judge in British Guiana.

Mr. RICHARD LEWIS TAPLEY, solicitor, has been elected Mayor of Torrington.

Mr. HENRY VICKERS, solicitor, has been appointed by the borough magistrates at Sheffield to be their Clerk.

OBITUARY.

SIR GEORGE ROSE.

We have to record the death, at the age of ninety-one, of Sir George Rose, well known to a past generation as a judge of the Court of Review in Bankruptcy, and afterwards a Master in Chancery. Sir George was born in 1782, and was educated at Westminster School. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1809, and subsequently obtained a considerable business at the Chancery bar. In or about 1824 he was made a King's Counsel, and in 1832, when the new Court of Bankruptcy was constituted, he was appointed one of the four judges of the "Court of Review," and was knighted. In 1840 he received the appointment of a Master in Chancery. For several years Sir George has been the senior bench at the Inner Temple. He died at Brighton on the 3rd ult.

MR. E. N. AYRTON.

We regret to announce the decease of this gentleman, which took place at Box Hill, Sussex, on November 28th. We have been favoured with the following notices of Mr. Ayrton's character and career:—

The late Mr. Edward Nugent Ayrton was the second son of Mr. Frederick Ayrton, an advocate of great ability in the Supreme Court of Bombay, and was born at Richmond on the 13th March, 1815. He was educated at Ealing, of which then large and well-known school he was captain at the early age of thirteen. Subsequently he went to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in honours in 1836. After taking his degree he spent some years in systematic travel in Europe and the East, and was called to the bar in 1845.

Mr. Ayrton practised at the equity bar and as a conveyancer, and, though not widely known, he was, by those with whom he was brought into contact, highly regarded for his deep and scientific knowledge of the principles of equity and real property law and for his varied learning and cultivation. To the public his writings were to some extent known, for he contributed leading articles to various newspapers, and most members of the legal profession have read articles written by him for the *Solicitors' Journal*, to which paper he was at one time a regular contributor.

His style was always clear and forcible, his aim being never to use a superfluous word, and was sometimes eloquent when he was dealing with such questions of home and foreign politics as greatly interested him; if the subject admitted of it, his writing was seldom without some touch of irony or humour. Mr. Ayrton published pamphlets on the subject of a decimal coinage (which he maintained should be established without disturbing the existing copper currency) and on improvements in the law of real property. On the passing of Lord Westbury's Transfer of Land Act he published an exhaustive work upon it.

Mr. Ayrton's health failed in the summer of 1871, and from that time he ceased to practise at the bar: his death was unexpected and almost instantaneous, having been caused by an attack of serous apoplexy on the 28th November, 1873, whilst residing at Box-hill, Sussex, where he was buried. His loss will be sincerely felt by many to whom he had endeared himself by his ready sympathy and his earnest assistance in any professional or literary work to which his aid was asked.

Mr. E. N. Ayrton's elder brother, Mr. Frederick Ayrton, was a member of the bar, and resided at Cairo, and we had occasion to notice his death last July. Mr. E. N. Ayrton's younger brother is the present Judge-Advocate-General.

The following remarks are contributed by one who is now a leader at the equity bar, and was for many years intimately acquainted with the late Mr. Ayrton:—

He was in every way a remarkable man. His intellect was of a powerful grasp, and enabled him to acquire a mastery over a wide extent of the domain of knowledge. Few men knew more than he did, or more thoroughly what he knew. He was an accomplished linguist and a critical scholar, while he was none the less a master in many departments of science, and was surpassed by few as a lawyer. Like John Stuart Mill, he had the characteristic of thoroughness in whatever he turned his mind to. He was moreover an excellent speaker, with a decided inclination for discussion, if not debate. On one occasion, several years ago, his argument of a case before Kindersley, V.C., which lasted many hours, was a surprise to the *habitués* of the court, as he was but seldom seen and little known there. People could not help asking why a man who could argue so forcibly and so well did not oftener appear? It is strange that it should be so, but so it was. For many years his business even as a conveyancer was inconsiderable, and he was of twenty years' standing before it could be spoken of otherwise. Indeed, outside a comparatively small number of persons he was hardly known as a regular practitioner, although there was no man in practice who was more constant and punctual in his attendance at chambers. By degrees, however, his reputation as a conveyancer began to be known among solicitors. The secret of his comparative want of professional success was probably owing in a great measure to his peculiarity of manner, which was very reserved, indeed to many persons somewhat repellant. He took no pains to make friends, or to encourage the approach of clients. Those who knew how kindly a nature was his, sometimes made merry at the angularity and frigidity of his bearing towards those who had merely a professional or but slight acquaintance with him; and this, no doubt, interfered with his prospects at the bar. But no man was more esteemed and prized among the few who knew him well. No man was a truer friend or a more honest or competent adviser. He was characterised no less by public spirit than by private worth, and it was not without great regret that his friends at the bar found that his health of late years precluded all hope of his taking the position as a public man for which his remarkable talents so well qualified him.

We have received from Messrs. Partridge & Cooper two of their diaries, which are conveniently arranged, well got up, and printed on good paper.

The will of Mr. James Holbert Wilson, of the Inner Temple and Onslow-square barrister-at-law, has been proved, says the *Illustrated London News*, under £30,000; and the will of Mr. Samuel Turner, of No. 5, Raymond's-buildings, Gray's-inn, barrister-at-law, under £30,000.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LEGAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of the executive committee of the association held on Friday, December 5th (R. Paul Amphlett, Esq., Q.C., M.P., in the chair), after a reference by the chairman to the great loss the association had sustained by the death of Vice-Chancellor Sir John Wickens, who was an active member of the executive committee, it was resolved that a deputation should wait upon the Lord Chancellor, to ascertain what steps the Government were prepared to take in order to give effect to the objects of the association.

Since the meeting of the executive committee it has been ascertained that the Lord Chancellor will receive the deputation in Lincoln's-inn at four o'clock on Friday, December 12th.

Several leading members of both branches of the profession have consented to act on the deputation.

The deputation will include the following members of the association:—Messrs. R.P. Amphlett, Q.C., M.P. (president), Sheldon Amos, Bryce, Fry, Q.C., E. E. Kay, Q.C., Lindley, Q.C., J. C. Mathew, Osborne Morgan, Q.C., M.P., Pearson, Q.C., Westlake, Arthur J. Williams, Wills, Q.C., F. T. Bircham (vice-president of the Incorporated Law Society), Clabon, Cookson, W. J. Farrer, H. R. Freshfield, Hollams, Janson (president of the Incorporated Law Society), Jevons, of Liverpool, B. G. Lake, J. V. Longbourne, Marshall, of Leeds (secretary of the Leeds Law Society), Ryland, of Birmingham (president of the Birmingham Law Society).

JURIDICAL SOCIETY.

THE LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

At a meeting of the Juridical Society held on Wednesday evening last, at the rooms of the Society, the Right Hon. Sir James Hannen in the chair, Mr. Charles Clark read a paper, contributed, he said, by a learned and distinguished friend. The writer began by referring to the question of the late Duke of Wellington, "How is the King's Government to be carried on?" and suggested that the greatest difficulty in answer to that question was this—that ministers were expected to be, not the best administrators of a Government, but men ready to propose changes in the laws and institutions of the country. To do so they must always command majorities in Parliament. But they might be left in a minority, not because of the change proposed, but because of the mode in which they proposed that it should be effected. In this way the country might be subjected to the loss of a good ministry, not upon any great matter of administration, but upon a small matter of legislation. Nobody doubted, he said, that Lord Selborne was a first-rate Lord Chancellor, but his peculiar merits in the service of the country might be lost on account of something entirely unconnected with the duties of his office. As a remedy, he proposed that any member of either House should be entitled, subject to the leave of the House, to bring in a bill for any reform or change, and that this bill should be referred to a committee (selected, say, on Mr. Hare's principle), which should report on it, and if favourably reported upon, it should be presented to the House with all the priority and advantages now conceded to a Government measure. If the committee did not report favourably, the member presenting it should still have the liberty to proceed with it as a private member does at present. Wherever legislation became necessary as a part of administration, as in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, a coercion bill, a suddenly required sanitary measure, or an unforeseen or dangerous foreign complication, the right and power of initiating legislation should be with the ministry. But, at all events, it seemed reasonable that a ministry should not go out except on a vote of want of confidence; and this should not be pronounced on account of dissent from the form of any particular measure.

Sir JAMES HANNEN said that if he might venture to point out what seemed to him to be the kernel of truth in that which had been put forward in the paper, it was this, that our present system of government, or rather our present system of carrying on the Government, did not leave sufficient opportunity for private members to submit their views to Parliament. He agreed that that was so;

in addition to the fact that the Government did take upon itself to do a great deal more than could possibly be done within the session, and that the forms of the House of Commons threw innumerable obstacles in the way of a private member. He had even heard it said by a member of the House, who was also a member of the legal profession, that the tricks and contrivances of the law were as nothing to those of the House of Commons in preventing a private member from bringing on his business. Never having had the honour of a seat in that House, he could not tell what amount of truth there was in that statement; but he had observed that private members had not the opportunity which it was desirable that men who had thought carefully on any particular subject should have of carrying out their views, and their propositions being made the subject of debate. He himself was afraid that the hope that they could ever eliminate party from the Government of the country was quite out of the question; but that seemed to be the idea and hope which were entertained by the writer of the paper; that there would come a happy time when the best men would be put into the right places, and there would be no attempt to remove them as long as they did their duty, and that an atmosphere of philosophical thought alone would reign in the popular body.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's Inn Hall, Strand, on Wednesday last, the subject for the evening's debate being "That the acceptance by the Prime Minister, without additional remuneration, of the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, vacates his seat in Parliament." The motion was lost by a majority of one.

BRISTOL ARTICLED CLERKS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held in the Law Library, Small-street, on Tuesday evening the 2nd inst. F. N. Budd, Esq., barrister, occupied the chair. Mr. Crewdson opened the following subject in the affirmative: "Was the case of *Hammersmith Railway Company v. Brand* (18 W. R. 12, L. R. 4 H. L. C. 171) rightly decided?" Mr. Dogget opposed, and, after a considerable discussion, the affirmative was carried by a large majority.

THE METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL LAW ASSOCIATION AND ITS PROPOSED UNION WITH THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

A paper read at the meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, held at Birmingham on the 21st October, 1873, by C. T. SAUNDERS, solicitor, Birmingham.

At an early period in our legal history, closely following, indeed, the formation of a distinctive class of legal practitioners, the advantage of associating together for a common object led to the establishment of the Inns of Court and Chancery, in which due provision was made for the study of the law. These institutions were originally open to all students and all legal practitioners in common. In process of time the distinction between the barrister and attorney became more marked, and the Inns of Chancery became the exclusive resort of the attorneys, while the four Inns of Court, which alone appear to have exercised the right of calling to the Bar, came to be almost exclusively occupied by the Bar, and at length, as is now well known, rules were passed excluding the attorneys from becoming members thereof.

Before, however, this final separation of the two branches of the students and practitioners of the law took place, the Inns of Court and Chancery, as seminaries of legal learning, had degenerated greatly from their former state.

The Inns of Chancery, which were adjuncts to or dependencies of the several Inns of Court, and as regards students formed, as far as can be ascertained, stepping stones to the greater Inns, lost the benefit of the readers, who were supplied by the parent Inns, and instituting no system of education in lieu thereof, sank into mere associations for good fellowship, of which such of them as now remain in legal ownership are examples, as New Inn, where Sir Thomas More studied as an apprentice of the law,

and Clement's Inn, where Justice Shallow followed less creditable pursuits.

The Inns of Court also gradually lost sight of the great object of their institution—viz., the study and advancement of the law on the part of the students resorting thereto, and became also, like the Inns of Chancery, associations for good fellowship only, and for making formal calls to the Bar without examination of students keeping the required number of terms.

It may be broadly stated, as the result of this degeneracy on the part of the Inns of Court and Chancery, that by the close of the seventeenth century these splendid endowments had become perverted from the main object of their institution, and that the student in either branch of the profession was left without guide or compass to grope his way as best he could towards the light.

The century which followed is not one in which the student of our legal history, any more than of our general history, finds much to admire. The law itself, which could never boast of a scientific basis or structure, had become overlaid by an elaborate system of grotesque fictions, and its simplicity refined away beyond the domain of common sense in the mazes and subtleties of special pleading; and if such was the state of the law, what was the condition of its practitioners?

Judging from such lights as are afforded to us by the current literature of those times, there is no doubt that the attorneys of the eighteenth century were, as a body, in evil repute. The Bar was then a comparatively small body of men; at the very close of the century it only numbered 500, and of these probably not more than 300 would be working members; indeed, I have somewhere seen it stated that in the memory of men now or lately living, the working Bar did not number more than 200 or 300.

The attorneys, therefore, of whom there were at the same time about 1,700 practising in London alone, must have composed much more than they do even now the great bulk of the profession, and it was, therefore, their characters principally, which determined the general opinion concerning the profession.

Of the state of the country practitioners at this period we have scant evidence, but as respect their professional attainments, they must have been as a body, from the very nature of things, an imperfectly educated and ill-informed class, having no educational or professional tests of fitness, and in a state of great isolation, living without the opportunity of general concert or the means of united action.

From an inquiry which I have made into the origin of the provincial law associations, I find that one existing law society, and one only, dates so far back as the last century—viz., the Yorkshire Society, founded in 1786; our own Birmingham Society dates from 1818.

Probably the chief functions of these early country societies consisted in clubbing together for the purchase of a library and promoting honourable professional conduct amongst the members. We may be sure that they never sought to influence the course of legislation, or raise the educational status of the profession or even reform the Inns of Court.

As regards the London attorneys, the Inns of Chancery were defunct except in some cases for social purposes, and no association had arisen in their place. There was a Law Club existing in London in the last decade of the century which called itself the Law Society, but its principal occupation was that of dining at a certain "Baptist's Head," and the higher objects for which modern associations have been formed did not apparently trouble its members.

It was at that time, about the year 1794, that the first attempt was made in London by a young and obscure man to improve the social and educational status of the attorneys through the foundation of a college or corporation to which all attorneys of respectable character should be admitted, and which should be governed by a council having power to examine all students previous to admission, with provisions for the erection of a hall and the formation of a library for the use of the members. The name of this obscure forerunner, who unfortunately for himself lived before his time, was Day; and a scarce and curious book in my possession, which he published, and which came from the library of the man who afterwards successfully founded the Incorporated Law Society, Bryan Holme, of New Inn, narrates the history of the attempt and its failure.

His statement of the evils then existing, such as the notorious malpractices of many of the practitioners, the consequent abhorrence, as he expresses it, with which the

profession of an attorney had come to be viewed, the want of some controlling body, the abandonment by the judges of the ancient statutory requirements as to examination of students, and their consequent admission as a mere matter of form without any security for their moral or educational fitness, show in what low state the profession then lay. He seems to have gone about his work with great energy, and obtained the approval of many judges and high dignitaries, as also of several influential London attorneys to his scheme, but there happened to be in his way the committee of the before mentioned Law Club or Society, having, as they conceived, vested interests in initiating and directing all such movements, and they could not brook that so young and obscure a man should set such a great stone rolling; and, having vainly endeavoured to induce him to hand over the prosecution of the matter to their own secretary, they ordered a dinner and held a meeting at the Baptist's Head and resolved that the existing state and condition of the profession was satisfactory, and did not call for the adoption of any such extensive reforms as those proposed by Mr. Day, and after a vain struggle on Mr. Day's part to excite the judges to action and other leading practitioners than those represented in the Law Club to take up the project, he was forced to throw it up in disgust, and consoled himself by publishing his book, and therein pillorying his opponents.

From this time matters appear to have slept for some thirty years, until about the year 1827, when Mr. Bryan Holme, of New Inn, then at the head of a great agency house, that of Holme, Frampton, & Loftus, revived Day's idea, apparently (from his MS note in Day's book) without having been aware of his previous abortive effort in the same direction, and having probably greater influence and experience than his unfortunate predecessor, and avoiding the shoals upon which his scheme was wrecked, he, in conjunction with his eminent contemporaries mentioned in the original charter of incorporation, succeeded in laying the foundation of the present Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, which soon attracted the support of a large proportion of the London practitioners, and a much smaller following of country members.

This new and important organisation was not long in using its influence to remove the most crying professional evils, and of these the absence of any test of the fitness of the students for admission into the ranks of the profession, was one of the most prominent. Legislative sanction to a fairly devised scheme of examination was obtained, and the first examination of articled clerks applying for admission was held in the year 1836, and the result of this great reform, especially as supplemented in more recent times by the institution of intermediate and preliminary examinations, has been to raise immeasurably the professional and social status of the attorney.

An examination of the reports of the society shows that a fair amount of work in other matters affecting the interests of the profession was accomplished, and that the profession soon derived substantial benefit from the presence in London of so powerful a representative body.

Notwithstanding, however, these evidences of successful work, it would seem that the country practitioners, who had never been attracted in any considerable numbers to the society, and who, at the period I am now approaching, were wholly unrepresented on the Council, conceived that their special interests were not sufficiently cared for, and that the society was really a London society, having chiefly at heart the promotion of London interests.

This discontent came to a head apparently in 1844, for in that year the Yorkshire Law Society, the oldest and still one of the most influential law societies in the Kingdom, passed a resolution in favour of establishing a Provincial Law Societies' Association, and so favourably was this movement received that a meeting of deputations from no less than fifteen provincial societies was held shortly after—viz., in January, 1845, at Manchester, and a purely provincial association was duly formed.

It was, however, to use the language of Mr. Shaen, in describing the history of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, in an address delivered some ten years ago, "soon felt that but very little effective work could be done without a central office and a permanent committee in London, and it was also felt that no solid grounds existed for making the organisation exclusively provincial," and on the 11th February, 1847, a numerous deputation from various provincial law societies came up to London, and met a considerable number of London solicitors, and at

that and a subsequent meeting the following resolutions were passed:—

1. That in the present state of the legal profession measures should be adopted for raising the character and position, and for promoting and supporting the interests, of solicitors.

2. That an association be formed for the purpose of promoting the interests of suitors and the better and more economical administration of the law, and obtaining the removal of the increasing and serious grievances to solicitors, and through them to suitors, and of maintaining the rights and increasing the usefulness of the profession.

3. That the association be called the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association.

The association thus founded soon obtained a very considerable amount of support from the profession. Its able and indefatigable secretary, Mr. Shaen, has indeed left on record in one of his addresses a humorous account of the apathetic indifference and transparent excuses with which he was frequently met in the town-to-town if not office-to-office canvass that he apparently made throughout the country in its early years, but the association supplied a want which had evidently been strongly felt for a more energetic and a more militant society than the then existing organisation of the Incorporated Law Society, and the roll of the association soon numbered, it is believed, about 1,000 members, of whom the greater part were provincial attorneys.

The excellent provision for holding annually a provincial meeting was, I believe, adopted from the first, and on the suggestion, I understand, of a member who has throughout been one of its most active and valued supporters, Mr. Arthur Ryland, the further excellent plan of reading papers on professional topics of interest at such meetings was adopted and for the first time carried out at the meeting held in Birmingham in 1855.

Since that time no change has, so far as I am aware, taken place in the constitution of the association, which has pursued the even tenor of its way, and I gladly admit has carried on for the past twenty years or so a very useful work. As regards the representation of provincial interests, I am bound to say that in that respect the association has been governed in accordance with the design of its institution, the provincial element having always largely preponderated on the committee.

The active work, it is true, has principally and inevitably fallen on a comparatively small but very able body of London attorneys; nevertheless, I believe that there has been always manifested the fullest desire to consult the opinions of the provincial members of the association, so far as they could be ascertained, upon all questions affecting the general interests of the profession, and the idea now adopted by the Incorporated Law Society of giving the provincial societies direct representation on the Council was anticipated some time ago by the committee of the Metropolitan and Provincial Association, who invited the societies to nominate members to serve on the committee.

The general work of the association in watching the progress of legislation and supporting such measures as tended to advance the character, and promote the legitimate influence, of our branch of the profession, and the simplification of the law, and consequent benefit to the suitor, has been, I believe, efficiently performed. It was not intended in establishing this association that it should be a thorn in the side of the elder society, but on the contrary that it should supplement its real or supposed deficiencies, and it may safely be affirmed that the committee of the association have as a rule carried out this idea, working judiciously, so far as possible, in harmony with the Incorporated Law Society, and on several important occasions they have been instrumental by their own more independent and lively exertions in exciting the Council of the elder society to decisive action.

As regards the provincial meetings of the association, their value and interest cannot be over estimated. They have been the means of bringing together in friendly intercourse the scattered and isolated country members of the profession to an extent never before realised. What pleasant and valuable acquaintances and friendships have been formed through their instrumentality, and how much one's knowledge of the character and ways of our professional brethren in widely different parts of England has been thereby enlarged.

There are, doubtless, many present who, from a much longer experience than I can boast of, can testify to the

pleasure and benefit they have derived from these annual gatherings.

Concerning an important feature of such meetings, the reading of and discussion upon papers of professional moment, I have, in preparing the present paper, looked through many of the past reports of the provincial meetings, and I have found them to contain a collection of papers of the highest interest. Reforms in our judicature system, inconsistencies and imperfections in our laws, the glaring defects of our legal education, the necessity for or revision of our relations with the Bar, the unsatisfactory mode of professional remuneration, have been, I find, discussed at these meetings long before they have been generally recognised, or in some cases even agitated in other quarters, and papers enforcing the required changes have been read by men of great eminence in our branch of the profession, some of whom have, alas, since fallen for ever out of our ranks.

Such is a brief sketch of the history and work of this association, which, although familiar to most of those present, I have thought it fair to bring before you preliminary to the consideration of the more immediate subject of this paper—viz., the advisability of the proposed amalgamation of this association with the Incorporated Law Society.

This question has been a frequent subject of discussion for some time, and at our last aggregate general meeting, held in London in June last, the following resolution was passed:—"That the managing committee be requested to consider and report to the next provincial general meeting of the society whether it will be for the advantage of this association that it should be amalgamated with the Incorporated Law Society, and, if so, upon what terms, and that, if it be considered necessary, the managing committee should confer in the meantime with the Council of the Incorporated Law Society on the subject."

In July last, about twelve months after this resolution was passed, members of the association were invited by circular from the committee to express their opinion as to the desirability of the proposed amalgamation, and I am informed that a large proportion of the provincial replies were in the affirmative, but concerning the action of the committee since these replies were received I have no reliable information. Their report however will, in accordance with the resolution of last year, be laid before this meeting.

The question is one which requires careful consideration, and is not wholly free from difficulty. I can readily understand that many warm and steadfast supporters of the association—some of them, perhaps, associated with it from its formation—will be very reluctant to see it absorbed in the elder society, whose shortcomings in former times excited probably much just dissatisfaction, and they may point to the work accomplished by the association, and to which I have adverted, as a proof of its success as an organisation, and as an argument for its continuance. Now I willingly admit that it has to a great extent fulfilled its mission and the design of its founders, but we have to consider the circumstances and necessities of the present time, and they are, I think it will be conceded, widely different from those of the time when this association was inaugurated.

The Incorporated Law Society could then be scarcely considered as more than a London society; it only numbered a scanty sprinkling of country members; it had no representatives of country members at its Council table; it rarely sought the opinion of the country societies, and possessed no connecting links with them. In later years, however, some provincial members have always been placed on the Council, and now, under the present charter, as the result of the late election, eleven country members out of the forty comprising its Council have seats, and in addition to this a direct connection with the provincial societies has been established in the yearly appointment of the presidents of ten provincial law societies as extraordinary members of Council.

Having regard to the present proportion of town and country members of the Incorporated Law Society these changes leave nothing to be complained of in the way of provincial representation, and if only the provincial members will make some sacrifice in the cause of the profession, and attend with some degree of regularity the Council meetings, provincial interests ought, and no doubt will be, abundantly protected.

As regards the work which the Metropolitan and Provincial Association has hitherto carried on by means of its central

or metropolitan organisation, this, as I have pointed out, has been of unquestionable benefit, especially to the country practitioners, whose interests have been always and properly considered by the committee to be entitled to special consideration, but I think we may fairly assume that under its new and enlarged organisation this work will now be efficiently performed by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, while concerning such matters as are more especially of provincial interest, there is now so much more vitality and desire for joint action in the leading provincial law societies than there was in former years, that it will be found more useful for them, without perhaps necessarily establishing a provincial society, to combine together as occasion may require for the accomplishment of objects of common interest.

I may refer in illustration to the joint action of the Societies of Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Newcastle-on-Tyne, in reference to the Judicature Commission, the late report of which embodied many of their recommendations, to the joint scale of costs settled by them for the country and which has now with some modification been adopted by the Incorporated Law Society, and to other subjects of interest.

Bearing then these new features of the present time in mind, it would appear that the necessity for the continuance of a second central organisation has entirely ceased, and that such is the opinion of the profession is, I apprehend, pretty conclusively proved by the waning numbers of this association, which have gradually dwindled down until according to this year's report we have only 194 London and 420 provincial members.

It is manifestly impossible that less than 200 London solicitors, however able—and there are many able men amongst them—can exercise much influence on the course of legislation, and, being backed by only some 400 provincial members, the total muster roll of the association gives little more than five per cent. of the entire body of the profession. A per centage so insignificant cannot seriously be considered to afford a real representation of the profession, either in town or country; indeed, we are reduced to the very rump of a legal parliament. It seems, therefore, to me far better that the profession should be represented by one strong and really representative organisation to which it should be the duty, I would willingly say the enforced and statutory obligation, of every member of the profession to belong, rather than by one moderately strong and another decidedly weak organisation. In view of coming, though unfortunately deferred, changes in the education of the attorney and in his relations to the Bar; in view too, of the organic changes already made and to be effected in our judicature system, involving in many ways the interests of the attorneys, it is of the utmost importance that the Incorporated Law Society should be made as powerful and representative a body as the united energies of all who take an interest in the future well being of the profession can make it; and I feel strongly that one important step towards the attainment of this object would be to merge the lesser society in the greater, and concentrate our efforts in enlarging its boundaries, improving its governing body, and making it indeed the modern, but greatly improved, substitute for the ancient but now hopelessly defunct Inns of Chancery.

I do not propose that such merger of our individuality as a separate association shall take place without due consideration or without certain guarantees for which we are fairly entitled to stipulate, such as the extension of the Council to the full number of fifty, authorised by the new charter, and the further increase of the provincial element therein, and, more important still, the continuance of the provincial meetings, including the reading of papers and discussions on legal topics as heretofore. The new bye-laws, in anticipation probably of the event we are now considering, give power to hold such meetings, and they would gain undoubtedly greatly in their influence on public and professional opinion if held under the auspices of the older and more powerful society.

Congresses are a prominent feature of the day, and it is sometimes the fashion to depreciate their value and to speak of the discussions thereat as being of little practical value; but let any one inclined to do this study carefully the report for example, of the last annual meeting of another learned body, the Medical Association, and he will hardly doubt the value, or underestimate the benefit, derivable from the members of a profession having common interests and

common objects in view holding annual meetings of this kind. Such gatherings are fruitful in results in various ways. They enable professional men to take stock, so to speak, from time to time of their position, to benefit by the interchange of thought and opinion between the leading minds of the profession in different parts, and to rub off the prejudices and narrowness of view which are the too frequent accompaniment of provincial life. They also lead to the formation of friendships most useful and pleasant in after life, and enable men who would otherwise remain obscure to distinguish themselves before their professional brethren, and they afford the opportunity of ventilating and stimulating the progress of useful reforms.

At the meeting of the Medical Association to which I have referred, the attendance was rather by thousands than by hundreds, and there was presented the interesting spectacle of the best men in both branches of that noble profession—the most famous physicians and the most eminent surgeons—assembling together in friendly intercourse, on equal footing, imparting their common experiences to their own mutual instruction, and to the inestimable advantage of the community at large.

Is it too much to hope that some of us may live to see the day when the Incorporated Law Society shall form an integral part of one great law university, and the existing distinction of caste having been swept away the barrister and the attorney shall in like manner meet on common ground in a truly representative lawyers' congress for the advancement of the higher interests of their profession and the promotion of the public good?

LIST OF PETITIONS

Filed in the Court of Common Pleas under the Corrupt Practices (Municipal Elections) Act, 1872.

ELECTION—NOVEMBER, 1873.

1. Liverpool.—Donnelly and Others, petitioners; Hamilton, respondent. J. A. Readhead, 13, Southampton-street, Bloomsbury, petitioners' agent; Field, Roscoe, & Co., 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields, respondent's agents.
2. Liverpool.—Donnelly and Others, petitioners; Hubback (Returning Officer), respondent. J. A. Readhead, 13, Southampton-street, Bloomsbury, petitioners' agent; Francis Venn, 1, Paper-buildings, Temple, respondent's agent.
3. Manchester.—Nield, petitioner; Batty, respondent.—Dangerfield & Fraser, 26, Craven-street, Strand, petitioner's agents.
4. Manchester.—Armitage and Others, petitioners; Reade, respondent. Cooke & Talbot, 6, Spring-gardens, petitioners' agent.
5. Hereford.—Shellard, petitioner; Pateshall and Another, respondents. Swinburne & Parker, 28, Bedford-row, petitioner's agents.
6. Hereford.—Bigglestone and Others, petitioners; Smith, respondent. Saunders & Hawksford, 36, Carey-street, W.C., petitioners' agents.
7. Hereford.—Hutton and Others, petitioners; Davies and Another, respondents. Saunders & Hawksford, 36, Carey-street, W.C., petitioners' agents.
8. Oldham.—Yates and Others, petitioners; Milnes and Another, respondents. Gregory, Rowcliffe, & Co., 1, Bedford-row, petitioners' agents.
9. Nottingham.—Pare and Others, petitioners; Hartshorn and Another, respondents. Torr, Janeway, & Co., 38, Bedford-row, petitioners' agents.
10. Nottingham.—Elliott and Another, petitioners; Nicholls and Another, respondents. Torr, Janeway, & Co., 38, Bedford-row, petitioners' agents.
11. Nottingham.—Place and Others, petitioners; Blain and Another, respondents. Field, Roscoe, & Co., 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields, petitioners' agents.
12. Nottingham.—Meats and Others, petitioners; Cranch and Another, respondents. Field, Roscoe, & Co., 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields, petitioners' agents.

Lord Cairns has directed that a third and final dividend of 5d. in the pound be paid to the creditors of the Albert Assurance Company. The previous dividends were 2s. and 1s. 6d. The total amount, therefore, which the creditors will have received will be 3s. 11½d. in the pound.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION

Hilary Term, 1874.

EXAMINATION.

The attention of students is requested to the following rules:—

As an encouragement to students to study Jurisprudence and Roman Civil Law, twelve studentships of one hundred guineas each shall be established, and divided equally into two classes; the 1st class of studentships to continue for two years, and to be open for competition to any student as to whom not more than four terms shall have elapsed since he kept his first term; and the 2nd class to continue for one year only, and to be open for competition to any student, not then already entitled to a studentship, as to whom not less than four and not more than eight terms shall have elapsed since he kept his first term; two of each class of such studentships to be awarded by the Council, on the recommendation of the Committee, after every examination before Hilary and Trinity Terms respectively, to the two students of each set of competitors who shall have passed the best examination in both Jurisprudence and Roman Civil Law. But the Committee shall not be obliged to recommend any studentship to be awarded if the result of the examination be such as in their opinion not to justify such recommendation.

Any student admitted before the 1st of January, 1873, shall be entitled to compete for the studentships above mentioned; provided that at the time of his examination not more than eleven terms shall have elapsed since his admission.

No student admitted after the 31st December, 1872, shall receive from the Council the certificate of fitness for call to the bar required by the four Inns of Court, unless he shall have passed a satisfactory examination in the following subjects, viz., 1st, Roman Civil Law; 2ndly, the Law of Real and Personal Property; and 3rdly, Common Law and Equity.

No student admitted after the 31st December, 1872, shall be examined for call to the bar until he shall have kept nine terms; except that students admitted after that day shall have the option of passing the examination in Roman Civil Law at any time after having kept four terms.

An examination will be held in January next, to which a student of any of the Inns of Court, who is desirous of becoming a candidate for a studentship, or honours, or of obtaining a certificate of fitness for being called to the bar, will be admissible.

Each student proposing to submit himself for examination will be required to enter his name at the treasurer's office of the Inn of Court to which he belongs, on or before Monday, the 29th day of December next; and he will further be required to state in writing whether his object in offering himself for examination is to compete for a studentship, or honours, or whether he is merely desirous of obtaining a certificate preliminary to a call to the bar.

Students admitted before 1st January, 1873, upon entering their names, are requested to state for which class of studentships they intend competing.

The examination will commence on Monday, the 5th day of January next, and be continued on the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday following.

It will take place in the hall of Lincoln's Inn; and the doors will be closed ten minutes after the time appointed for the commencement of the examination.

The examination by printed questions will be conducted in the following order:—

Monday and Tuesday, 5th and 6th January, at ten until one, and from two until five on each day, the examination of candidates for studentships in Jurisprudence and Roman Civil Law.

The examination of candidates for honours and pass certificates will take place as follows:—

Wednesday morning, 7th January, at ten, on Constitutional Law and Legal History; in the afternoon, at two, on Equity.

Thursday morning, 8th January, at ten, on Common Law; in the afternoon, at two, on the Law of Real and Personal Property.

Friday morning, 8th January, at ten, on Jurisprudence, Civil and International Law, Public and Private; in the afternoon, at two, the oral examination of candidates for

pass certificates will be conducted by the several examiners. The oral examination for the studentships or honours will be conducted in the same order, during the same hours, and on the same subjects, as those already marked out for the examination by printed questions.

JURISPRUDENCE, CIVIL AND INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Candidates for the studentships will be examined in the following subjects:—

1. The Institutes of Gaius, and of Justinian.
2. The History of Roman Law.
3. The Civil Law respecting Testaments.
4. Principles of Jurisprudence developed by Bentham, Austin, and Maine.
5. Elements of International Law, and of the Conflict of National Laws.

Candidates for honours will be examined in all the following subjects; candidates for a pass certificate in No. 2 only (the Institutes of Justinian).

1. The Institutes of Gaius.
2. The Institutes of Justinian.
3. The History of Testamentary Disposition.
4. Digest Book L. tit. xvi. (De verborum significatione); Book L. tit. xvii. (De diversis regulis juris antiqui).
5. International Law, so far as it relates to Neutrals.

The Examiner in Constitutional Law and Legal History will examine in the following books and subjects:—

1. Hallam's Middle Ages, chapter 8.
2. Hallam's Constitutional History.
3. Broom's Constitutional Law.
4. The State Trials of the Stuart Period.
5. Blackstone's chapter on the Progress of the Laws of England.

Candidates for honours will be examined in all the above-mentioned books and subjects; candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined in No. 1 and No. 3 only, or in No. 2, and No. 3 only of the foregoing subjects, at their option.

The Examiner in Equity will examine in the following subjects:—

1. Infants.
2. Mortgages.
3. Suretyship.
4. Administration of Real and Personal Estates.
5. Trusts.

Candidates for honours will be examined in the above-mentioned subjects, under heads 1, 2, 3, and 4; candidates for a pass certificate only, in those under heads 4 and 5.

The Examiner in the Law of Real and Personal Property will examine in the following subjects:—

1. The Feudal Law, as adopted in England, and the Statutory Changes in it.
2. Estates, Rights, and Interests in Real and Personal Property; and Assurances and Contracts concerning the same.
3. Mortmain; Perpetuity or Remoteness; Conditions; Easements; Notice; Election and Satisfaction.

Candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined in the elements of the foregoing subjects; candidates for honours will have a higher examination.

The Examiners in Common Law will examine in the following subjects:—

1. The Law of Contracts and Mercantile Law.
2. The Law of Torts.
3. The Law of Crimes.
4. The Law of Procedure and Evidence.

Candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined on general and elementary principles of law; and from candidates for honours the examiners will require a more advanced knowledge of the application of those principles, and a knowledge of leading decisions.

LEGAL ITEMS.

An Extradition Treaty between Austria and Great Britain was signed at Vienna on Wednesday, the 3rd inst.

Miss Artie Wallace, says the *Albany Law Journal*, has been appointed deputy circuit clerk of Boone County, Kentucky.

The *Western Morning News* announces on authority that the title of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas will be Baron Coleridge of Ottery St. Mary's.

A circular has been issued from the Home Office stating that the inspection of nuisances under the Nuisance Remo-

val and Public Health Acts, will not in future (except as regards proceedings under the 29 & 30 Vict. c. 90, s. 16) be recognised by the Secretary of State as a police duty.

It is stated, says the *Albany Law Journal*, that at the commencement of the judicial career of the Hon. Caleb Cushing he read sixty volumes of Massachusetts reports in nineteen days, and that his average study and labour for years has been seventeen hours a day.

From the official return of the proceedings before the district registrars of the Probate Court in the year 1872 it appears that in Liverpool 711 probates, 427 letters of administration, and 50 letters of administration with the wills annexed were granted. The probates and letters of administration with the wills annexed were sworn under £2,819,815, and the letters of administration £359,350. The duty received amounted to £46,632, and the fees to £3,778 19s. 6d. There were 16 caveats.

The *Times* states that, for the first time in the annals of the Woolwich Police-court, an order was issued last Wednesday but one against a soldier for the support of his illegitimate child. Hitherto non-commissioned officers and men of the army have been exempt from such obligations, but the new clause in the Mutiny Act renders them liable to have deductions made in their pay to the extent of 3d. for a private soldier and 6d. for a non-commissioned officer for the support, not only of their illegitimate children, but of their lawful wives and families.

The *Daily Telegraph* prints the following inaccurately expressed paragraph:—"During the sitting in the Rolls Court yesterday afternoon, the Master of the Rolls, addressing the counsel present, said that when an adverse judgment was given against one of the parties in a suit referring to a small matter of property, &c., that side generally petitioned to be 'allowed costs.' Now, whilst he would admit that, in some very exceptional instances, costs might and should be allowed to the losing side, still they ought not to be made the rule, but rather the exception. It was contrary to all principles and notions of justice and law that the party who had received the benefit of the judgment should not be allowed his costs rather than the 'losing' one. Various applications to allow costs to the defeated side had frequently been made to him; but whatever the practice obtaining in other quarters, he for his part would take care that, as a rule, he would cause the side which lost the suit to pay its own costs."

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Dec. 12, 1873.

2 per Cent. Consols, 93 x d	Annuities, April, '85 97
4 1/2 per Cent. Account, 92 1/2 x d	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
5 per Cent. Reduced, 91 1/2	Ex Billa, £1000, 2 1/2 per Ct. 6 dis
New 3 per Cent., 91 1/2	Ditto, £500, Do 6 dis
Do. 3 1/2 per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 6 dis
Do. 2 1/2 per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 4 1/2 per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ct. (last half-year) 249
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	120
Stock Caledonian	100	104 1/2
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	120
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	51 1/2
Stock Great Northern	100	128 1/2
Stock Do., A Stock	100	164 1/2
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	114
Stock Great Western-Original	100	127 1/2
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	147 1/2
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	88 1/2
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	94 1/2
Stock London and North-Western	100	156
Stock London and South-Western	100	108
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	80 1/2
Stock Metropolitan	100	69 1/2
Stock Do., District	100	27
Stock Midland	100	137 1/2
Stock North British	100	73 1/2
Stock North Eastern	100	174 1/2
Stock North London	100	117
Stock North Staffordshire	100	67
Stock South Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	106 1/2

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10 1/2 p Ct. Apr. 74, 305	Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '79
Ditto for Account. —	Ditto, 3 1/2 per Cent., May, '79 99 1/2
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 16 1/2	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto for Account. —	April, '64 —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 10 1/2	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 100 1/2
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto Enfranch Ppr., 1 per Cent. 94	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate was reduced on Thursday from 5 per cent. to 4 1/2 per cent. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has increased from 45.37 to 48.54. On Saturday last the railway market was very firm, and on Monday, owing to the purchases to close the accounts of a broker who had failed with heavy liabilities, prices rose considerably. There has since been some reaction and prices have declined, but they rose again after the publication of the Bank return. With the exception of a temporary excitement occasioned by the cause above mentioned the foreign market has been inactive throughout the week.

The annual meeting of the Gresham Life Assurance Society was held on Monday last. The report stated that the new premiums for the year amounted to £44,338, the annual income £453,314, and the realized assets to £1,886,993.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

- BRANSON—On Dec. 8, the wife of Reginald Branson, barrister-at-law, Bombay, of a son.
- COOPER—On Dec. 4, at 12, Provost-road, Haverstock-hill, Hampstead, London, N.W., the wife of W. Wellington Cooper, jun., Esq., solicitor, of a son.
- PRIOR—On Dec. 11, at Harrow, the wife of John Templer Prior, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, of a daughter.
- WRIGHT—On Dec. 7, at Spencer-road, Putney, the wife of H. Wilkey Wright, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

- ELLINGHAM—CLAYDEN—On Dec. 2, at Oakley, near Bishop's Stortford, Edward Nugent Bellingham, of Swansea, solicitor, to Caroline, second daughter of the late John Clayden, Esq., of Littlebury.
- KING—LESSON—On Dec. 6, at the parish church, Chiswick, William King, of Lincoln's-inn, Esq., barrister-at-law, to Eleanor Constance, only daughter of the late John Seymour Lesson, Esq.

DEATHS.

- SCOTT—On Dec. 7, David Scott, Esq., Conveyancer, of 102, Penrose-street, Walworth, and Middle Temple.
- TWOPENY—On Dec. 5, in Upper Grosvenor-street, William Twopeny, formerly of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, aged 76.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

- Baxter, Robert, Philip Frederick Rose, Henry Eliand Norton, Robert, Dudley, Baxter, Markham Spofforth, and John Brewer, attorneys, solicitors, and parliamentary agents, 6, Victoria st, Westminster.
- Goldingham, Herbert George, and Francis Parker, Worcester, attorneys and solicitors. Dec 1.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- Ballycummick Copper Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 27, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Dec 13. Childs and Batten, Fleet st, a solicitors for the petitioners.
- Calliards Manufacturing Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Nov 22, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Clarke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Standing, Rochdale, solicitor for the petitioners.
- Co-operative Brewery Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Nov 22, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Tattam, Gresham house, solicitor for the petitioner.
- "Junias" Newspaper Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Nov 22, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Pike, Serle st, Lincoln's inn, Solicitor for the petitioners.
- Leeds and Yorkshire Shoddy, Manure, and Superphosphate Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Dec 2, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Dec 13. Singleton and Tattershall, Great James st, agents for Fawcett and Malcolm, Leeds, solicitors for the petitioners.

Phosphate Manure Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Nov 21, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Suell, George st, Mansion house, solicitor for the petitioners.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

East Palborno Tin Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated Nov 26, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Carlyon and Paul, Truro, solicitors for the petitioners.

Polebrebo Mining Company.—Petition for winding up, presented to the Vice Warden, on Nov 27, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, 3, Onslow square, Brompton, on Wednesday, Dec 10 at 3. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before Dec 8, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitors, or their agents. Gregory and Co., Bedford row, agents for Hodge and Co., Truro, Cornwall, solicitors for the petitioner.

FRIDAY, Dec. 5, 1873.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Brighton Laundry Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Nov 29, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Halse and Co., Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioner.

Bracanza Gold Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Nov 29, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. MacKreth, Moorgate st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Cuiba Gold Mining Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Aug 6, appointed Frederick Whinnery, Old Jerry, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, as to those resident in Europe, on or before Jan 12, and as to those resident elsewhere than in Europe on or before April 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above, Monday Jan 26 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims of European creditors, and Monday April 20 at 12, for creditors other than European creditors.

TUESDAY, Dec. 9, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Landowners West of England and South Wales Land Drainage and Inclosure Company.—Petition for winding up, presented Dec 8, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Friday, Dec 19. Stogdon, Clement's inn, Strand, solicitor for the petitioner.

Saint Peter's College, Eaton square.—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Edwards, King st, Cheapside. Monday, Jan 12 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Sir George Innes, Baronet, Clench, Sager, and Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated June 21, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Davidson and Co, Basinghall st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Dec. 9, 1873.

True Blue Friendly Society, Red Lion Inn, Sutton, Surrey. Nov 23 Castle st (MacNamara and Co.) Provident Society, Castle st, Finsbury, Dec 5

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

Bow, John, Warwick, Grocer. Dec 22. Spencer v Bow, M.R. Sander-son, Warwick
Cooper, Ann Eliza, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex. Dec 31. Dresser v Gladwin, V.C. Malins. Bargin, John st, Bedford row
Goode, Henry Sale, Howland st, Finsbury square, Solicitor. Jan 6. Lea v Lea, M.R. Lea, Farnival's inn, Holborn
Goodrich, Ermingerde, Brighton, Sussex. Dec 31. Armstrong v Metcalfe, V.C. Malins. Bargin, John st, Bedford row
Gordon, Ann, Richmond rd, Islington. Jan 12. Hill v Hill, V.C. Hall.
Clapham and Fitch, Bishopsgate Without
Hallworth, Charles, Maulden, Bedford, Miller. Jan 1. Hallworth v Hallworth, V.C. Bacon. Wright, Amphibill
Kennedy, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. Jan 1. Kennedy v Kennedy, M.R. Gramshaw, Brighton
Mappin, William, Sheffield, Froviation Dealer. Jan 6. Mappin v Williamson, M.R. Wilson, Sheffield
Walker, John, Nottingham. Jan 5. Lampard v Walker, V.C. Malins. Brittle, Nottingham
Weekes, Thomas, Halling, near Rochester, Kent, Lime Burner. Dec 31. Weekes v Bulbrook, V.C. Hall. Prall, Rochester

FRIDAY, Dec. 5, 1873.

Allen, William, Sutton, Chester, Farmer. Dec 31. Allen v Lowe, M.R. Linaker, Runcorn
Andrews, John, Modbury, Devon, Esq. Jan 10. Harris v Andrews, M.R. Square, Kingbridge
Bradford, Martha, Beresford st, Waltham. Dec 24. Bradford v Smith, V.C. Bacon. Lewis, Wilmington square
Brewitt, Thomas, Rayleigh, Essex, Esq. Jan 16. Hilliard v Fulford, M.R. De Gex, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
Bull, Benjamin, Harlow, Essex, Farmer. Jan 1. Giles v Bernard, M.R. Windus, Epping
Fischer, Peter Joseph, Upper Norwood, Innkeeper. Jan 1. Fischer v Edbrooke, V.C. Hall. Crafters, Blackfriars rd
Robinson, Margaret, York. Dec 31. Brynshay v Robinson, M.R. Watson, Stockton-upon-Tees
Rose, William Barker, Howick place, Westminster, Barrister-at-law. Dec 31. Oller v Rose, M.R. Brewer, Victoria st, Westminster
Rowe, Edward, Portea, Southampton, Paymaster H.M.'s R.N. Jan 10. Rowe v Rowe, V.C. Hall. Watson and Son, Bouverie st, Fleet st
Sheat, William Henry, Finborough rd, South Kensington. Feb 14. Sheat v Sheat, M.R. Grundy, Budge row, Cannon st
Wills, Harriet, Cheltenham, Gloucester. Jan 10. Wills v Hartnell, V.C. Malins. Kinnier, Swindon

TUESDAY, Dec. 9, 1873.

Clarke, Joseph, Ramsey, Essex, Farmer. Jan 1. Clarke v Clarke, M.R. Goody, Colchester
Graham, William, Penrith, Cumberland, Tailor. Jan 15. Sinclair v H.M.'s Attorney-General, V.C. Hall. Scott, Penrith
Hooper, George Henry, Bloombury square, Esq. Feb 2. Hooper v Maude, V.C. Bacon. Rivington, Fenchurch buildings
McCabe, Esther Jeremy, Ticehurst, Sussex. Jan 12. McCabe v Galsworthy, V.C. Hall. Potter, King st, Cheapside
Walker, David, Rise End, Middleton, Derby, Victualler. Jan 12. Barrow v Walker, V.C. Malins. Barrow, Matlock, Bath
Weld, Jane Charlotte, Baroness, Ostend, Belgium. Jan 5. Edmonds v Farrell, M.R. Harting, Lincoln's inn fields

Creditors under 22 & 23 Viet. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

Barnett, Francis Lyon, Roebuck terrace, Great Dover st, Southwark. Pawnbroker. Jan 28. Comins, Great Portland at
Bryson, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Shipowner. Jan 10. Thorne, Kingston-upon-Hull
Davis, Mary Ann, Welbeck at, Cavendish square. Dec 21. Chauntrell and Pollock, Lincoln's inn fields
Dyer, John, Great Cornard, Suffolk, Gentleman. Jan 1. Ransom and Son, Sudbury
Fry, Charles, Lewisham, Kent, Corn and Coal Merchant. Dec 16. Parkes and Son, Lewisham
Harvey, James, Botsford, Leicester, Gentleman. March 1. Thompson, Grantham
Hodges, Thomas Powell, Bristol, Accountant. Jan 17. Livett, Bristol
Jackson, George Christopher, Moor, Worcester, Farmer. Dec 31. Corbett, Forests
Knight, Henry, Manchester, Steamhorse Proprietor. Dec 24. Almond, Manchester
Marques, Elizabeth Cardozo, Twyford, Berkshire. Jan 28. Wootton, Finsbury circus
Mithrop, George, Wakefield, York, Printing Ink Manufacturer. Jan 1. Harrison and Smith, Wakefield
Newsam, Philip William, Warwick, Gentleman. Dec 31. Chadwick, Warwick
Power, Thomas Marler, Barkston-in-the-Willows, Lincoln, Farmer. March 1. Thompson, Grantham
Rider, Mary, Ann Elizabeth, Ramsgate, Kent. April 6. Daniel, Ramsgate
Roberts, Esther, Liverpool. Jan 1. Holt and Rows, Liverpool
Robertson, Robert, Morpeth, Northumberland, Grocer. Dec 20. Woodman, Morpeth
Roebuck, George, Leeds, Woolen Draper. Feb 1. Middleton and Sons, Leeds
Sanders, Josiah, Bristol, Surgical Instrument Maker. Dec 31. Harwood, Bristol
Torriano, Charles James, Lieutenant East India Company's Service. April 4. Hensman and Nicholson, College hill

FRIDAY, Dec. 5, 1873.

Atkinson, Matilda, Saint Peter's square, Hammersmith. Jan 10. Charles Goodwyn, Boundary road, Saint John's Wood
Chambers, James, Swaffham Bulbeck, Cambridge, Farmer. Dec 23. Button, Newmarket
Makin, Joseph, Monks Eleigh, Suffolk, Farmer. Jan 6. Robinson, Safford, and Grimwade, Hadleigh
Ellice, Russell, Lombard st, Banker. Jan 31. Dixon, Finsbury square
Everitt, James, Coventry, Hairdresser. Jan 1. Minster, Coventry
Fenton, Charlotte, Torworth, Nottingham. Jan 15. Marshall, Sons, and Beschoy, East Bedford
Gower, James Samuel, West Brighton, Sussex. Jan 24. Walker & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
Grant, William, Nuttall Hall, Lancaster, Esq. Feb 1. Woodcock and Sons, Haslingden
Haddon, Thomas Henry, New square, Lincoln's inn. Barrister-at-Law. Jan 15. Western and Sons, Great James st, Bedford row
Hoe, Richard, Saint James rd, Old Kent rd, Packing Case Maker. Jan 30. Carter and Bell, Leadenhall st
Hutchins, Martha, Alton, Southampton. Dec 31. Trimmer, Alton
Lloyd, Benjamin, Rhymney, Bedwellty, Monmouth, Mason. Dec 31. Dixon, Fontymster
Lodwick, Peter, Westbourne terrace, General. Jan 15. Western and Sons, Great James st
Poole, James, Westbury-upon-Trym, Bristol, Esq. Jan 21. Pessell Pritchard, and Swann, Bristol
Rees, Rees Edward, Panthriwgoch, Monmouth, Yeoman. Feb 2. Farr and Wade, Newport
Temple, Samuel, Cleethorpes, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 15. Ball, Louth
White, John, Hanover square, Esq. Jan 15. Lee, Pemberton, and Whiting, Rev James, Royston, Herts. Jan 17. White, Colchester
Winmill, Thomas, Newport, Monmouth, Gent. Feb 1. Lloyd, Newport

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Ashby, George, High st, Hampstead, Grocer. Pet Nov 23. Hasle, Dec 12 at 11
Deveson, Charles, Herville terrace, Hornsey rd, Cowkeaper. Pet Nov 23. Munday. Dec 18 at 12
Ricket, Edward, South Lambeth rd, Cook. Pet Nov 27. Pet Nov 27 Dec 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Bosby, William, Leigh, Essex, Grocer. Pet Nov 23. Gopp. Chelmsford. Dec 16 at 2
Dawson, Alice, Manchester, Beer Retailer. Pet Nov 27. Kay. Manchester, Dec 16 at 9 30

Durham, Frederick, Thorne, York, Land Surveyor. Pet Nov 26. Wakefield, Dec 12 at 1
 Dye, George, Liverpool, Grocer. Pet Nov 27. Watson, Liverpool, Dec 15 at 3
 Johnson, Elizabeth, Harborne, Stafford, Widow. Pet Nov 26. Chauntier, Birmingham, Dec 15 at 1
 Shephard, Samuel, Redruth, Cornwall, Bootmaker. Pet Nov 28. Chilcott, Truro, Dec 13 at 11.80
 Wilson, John, West Gorton, Lancashire, Oil Refiner. Pet Nov 28. Kay, Manchester, Dec 18 at 9.30

FRIDAY, Dec. 5, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Solomon, George, Mount place, Whitechapel. Pet Dec 1. Brougham. Dec 19 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Cox, Thomas George, Birmingham, Gent. Pet Dec 1. Chauntier. Birmingham, Dec 23 at 11
 Cropp, John, Manchester, Beerseller. Pet Dec 3. Hulton, Salford, Dec 17 at 11
 Hurbale, Edwin Beedle, Cheltenham, Gloucester, no occupation. Pet Dec 2. Gale, Cheltenham, Dec 20 at 11
 Johnson, Edwin, Leek, Stafford, Attorney-at-law. Pet Dec 3. Mair. Macclesfield, Dec 19 at 3
 May, William, Truro, Cornwall, Boot Manufacturer. Pet Dec 2. Chilcott. Truro, Dec 17 at 11
 Montgomery, Thomas Henry, The Broadway, Ealing, Tailor. Pet Nov 29. Ruston. Brentford, Dec 20 at 10
 Murphy, Bernard, Liverpool, Provision Dealer. Pet Dec 1. Watson. Liverpool, Dec 17 at 3
 Pearson, Henry, Carnarvon, Provision Dealer. Pet Nov 27. Jones. Bangor, Dec 16 at 3
 Richardson, Harry, Birmingham, Scrivener. Pet Dec 1. Chauntier. Birmingham, Dec 17 at 2
 Seton, Thomas Mammatt, Coventry, Warwick, Silk Throwster. Pet Dec 2. Kirby, Coventry, Dec 18 at 2

TUESDAY, Dec. 9, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Lazarus, Joseph, Whitechapel rd, Rag Merchant. Pet Dec 5. Haslitt. Dec 19 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Alsworth, James, Manchester, Publisher. Pet Dec 5. Kay, Manchester, Dec 23 at 9.30
 Crickmore, Jarvis, Bungay, Suffolk, Coal Dealer. Pet Dec 5. Walker. Great Yarmouth, Dec 22 at 3
 Holson, Samuel, Ramsey, Huntingdon, Farmer. Pet Nov 29. Gaches. Peterborough, Dec 20 at 11
 Jordan, John, Green lanes, Stoke Newington, Dairyman. Pet Dec 6. Puley. Edmonton, Dec 23 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

Marshall, Benjamin John, Hatton garden, Gent. Nov 28
 Hekley, Charles Condamine, Old Broad street. Nov 17

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

TUESDAY, Dec. 2, 1873.

Abbott, Thomas James, Princes st, Rotherhithe, out of business. Dec 1-10 at offices of Lewis, Chancery lane. Long
 Abraham, Isaac, Liverpool, Furniture Dealer. Dec 18 at 3 at offices of Smart and Co, Cheapside. Norton, Liverpool
 Adams, William, Armagh rd, North Bow, Builder. Dec 16 at 2 at offices of Hudson and Co, Beeklersbury
 Appleby, Lancelot, Middlesbrough, York, Cabinet Maker. Dec 18 at 12 at the Corporation Hotel, Albert rd, Middlesbrough. Dale, York
 Auld, John, Manchester, Accountant. Dec 17 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Pool st, Market st, Manchester. Gould, Manchester
 Bandy, William Henry, Bedford, Beerhouse Keeper. Dec 16 at 12 at offices of Smith, Old st, St Luke's, London. Stimson, Bedford
 Bent, Jane, Manchester, Milliner. Dec 19 at 3 at offices of Haime and Co, Broadmeade st, Manchester
 Blake, John, Melkham, Wilts, Bank Manager. Dec 15 at 1 at the Royal Hotel, Bath. Nodder
 Blane, Henry Ralph, Bedford, Solicitor's Clerk. Dec 18 at 11 at offices of Shepherd, Park st West, Luton. Nove, Luton
 Bolton, John, Stockton-on-Tees, General Draper. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Hopper, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bond, Thomas, and Alfred Bond, Longton, Stafford, Grocers. Dec 11 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
 Boynton, John, Middlesbrough, York, Commission Agent. Dec 17 at 3 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zetland rd, Middlesbrough
 Bryan, William, Dudley, Worcester, Grocer. Dec 13 at 11 at offices of Lewis, Wolverhampton st, Dudley
 Caine, John, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. Dec 15 at 11 at offices of Allen, Union passage, Birmingham
 Chessman, Charles Taylor, Hove, Sussex, Fruiterer. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Mills, New rd, Brighton
 Clarkson, Mary, Waverline, near Liverpool, Confectioner. Dec 12 at 3 at offices of Teaboy and Lynch, Sweating st, Liverpool
 Cook, Richard, Sheffield, Commission Agent. Dec 13 at 1 at offices of Tattershall, Queen st, Sheffield
 Cooper, Josiah, Longton, Stafford, Plasterer. Dec 18 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
 Dornay, Peter, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Silk Throwster. Dec 13 at 12 at offices of Hand, Church side, Macclesfield
 Edmonds, Philip, and Thomas Bennett, Charlotte st, Blackfriars rd, Stroudersons. Dec 13 at 2 at offices of Dubois, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Maynard, Clifford's Inn

Evans, John, Slough, Buckingham, Plumber. Dec 16 at 11 at the Crown Hotel, Slough. Charley, Slough
 Evans, Thomas, Sheffield, Accountant. Dec 11 at 12 at offices of Smith and Hinde, Bank st, Sheffield
 Falslaw, William, Turnham Green, Grower and Preserver of Fruit. Dec 15 at 1 at offices of Barron, Queen st, Cannon st
 Fielding, Abraham, Sowerby Bridge, York, Drysalter. Dec 15 at 2 at the Griffin Inn, George st, Halifax. Jubbs, Halifax
 Finlay, Hunter, Lewisham, Kent, Doctor. Dec 12 at 12 at offices of Haynes, Warwick court, Gray's Inn
 Foster, William, Darlaston, Stafford. Dec 13 at 2 at offices of Corbett, Penfold st, Darlaston
 Gaunt, Joseph, jun, Sheffield, Wood Cutter. Dec 12 at 12 at offices of Tasker and Sons, North Church st, Sheffield. Webster, Sheffield
 Gibbs, George William, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Baker. Dec 15 at 2 at offices of Wilkinson and Howlett, Bedford st, Covent Garden
 Glover, Joseph, jun, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. Dec 18 at 2 at the Wellington Hotel, Leicester. Fowler and Co, Leicester
 Green, James Hammond, Leeds, Builder. Dec 13 at 2 at the Star and Garter Hotel, Cale lane, Leeds
 Green, James Turtton, Stourbridge, Worcester, Plumber. Dec 13 at 11 at the Commissioners' Rooms, Market st, Stourbridge. Wall, Stourbridge
 Hainsworth, John Edward, Savile Town, York, Engineer. Dec 17 at 10.30 at offices of Scholes and San, Lees rd, Dewsbury
 Hardy, Martha, Rochdale, Lancashire, Milliner. Dec 17 at 3 at offices of Standing, Butts, Rochdale
 Harrison, John, Barnet st, Hackney rd, Tailor. Dec 22 at 3 at offices of Heathfield, Lincoln's Inn fields
 Hawkyard, Thomas, sen, Thomas Hawkyard, jun, and James Hawkyard, Dearnley, Rochdale, Lancashire, Wool Dealers. Dec 16 at 3 at the Wheat Sheaf Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Standing, Rochdale
 Henderson, Robert William, Cuthbert, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. House Decorator. Dec 22 at 12 at offices of Storey, Cross House, Westgate rd, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Hicks, John, Mile End rd, Coffee house Keeper. Dec 16 at 2 at offices of Robinson, Gresham house, Old Broad st
 Johnson, Samuel, Farsley, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Ferns, Bank st, Leeds
 Jones, Edward, Fulham rd, Brompton. Dec 17 at 3 at office of Lovering and Co, Gresham st. Piesse and Son, Old Jewry chambers
 Kenward, George, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Boot Maker. Dec 15 at 12 at offices of Nicholson, London Bridge Railway Approach. Jones, Hastings
 Kestlowell, Harry Mason, King st, Covent Garden, Horticultural Auctioneer. Dec 16 at 3 at offices of Piewa and Irvine, Mark lane
 Laycock, Francis, Manchester, Tea Dealer. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester
 Light, Albert Joseph, St Margaret's place, Southwark, Builder. Dec 8 at 2 at offices of Kynaston and Gasquet, Queen st, Cheapside
 Lumley, William, Morpeth, Northumberland, Cabinet Maker. Dec 15 at 11 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 MacDonald, Eunice, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Widow. Dec 16 at 3 at Whitehaven. Talson
 Macveigh, James, jun, Maxwell rd, Moore Park, Fulham, Draper. Dec 16 at 12 at 145, Cheapside. Peacock and Goddard, South square, Gray's Inn
 Messenger, James Henry, High st, Hampstead, Artists' Colourman. Dec 13 at 2 at Mason's Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Downing, Basinghall st
 Myatt, George Alban, Rugeley, Stafford, Saddler. Nov 17 at 3 at the Three Tuns Inn, Gaoigote st, Stafford. Palmer, Rugeley
 Naylor, Sarah, and John Barker, Littleton, York, Dyers. Dec 15 at 11 at the Black Bull Hotel, Mirkfield. Iberson
 Newall, Joshua, Smithwick, Stafford, Grocer. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Wood, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 Pearce, William, St Stephen's-by-Saltash, Cornwall, Miller. Dec 18 at 12 at offices of Gilbard, Chapel st, Dorvont
 Pierce, William, and Samuel Gordon, Eaton rise, Ealing, Builders. Dec 17 at 2 at office of Harris and Finch, Thayer st, Manchester square
 Powell, Frederick, Tunbridge, Kent, Builder. Dec 13 at 11 at office of Gorham and Warner, High st, Tunbridge
 Presdee, Edward, Birmingham, Boot Maker. Dec 15 at 10 at offices of Duke, Christchurch passage, Birmingham
 Pritchard, William Elsmore, Monmouth, Baker. Dec 13 at 11 at office of Gibbs, Commercial st, Newport
 Raven, Thomas, Penrith, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Dec 12 at 3 at the Fish Inn, Penrith. Brotch
 Roadnight, William, Yiewsley, Middlesex, Farmer. Dec 20 at 3 at the Chequers Hotel, Uxbridge. Heron, Ely place, Holborn
 Ross, John, New Church rd, Camberwell, Timber Dealer. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Silverter, Great Dover st, Newington
 Rose, William Henry, Bristol, Marine Store Dealer. Dec 10 at 11 at offices of Emery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
 Ross, John, Railway arches, Shepherd's Bush, Carpenter. Dec 11 at 1 at offices of Dent, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st
 Rust, Thomas, Bedford, Coal Merchant. Dec 9 at the Red Lion Hotel, Bedford, in lieu of the place originally named
 Senior, John Jones, Langollen, Denbigh, Saddler. Dec 16 at 2 at the Lion Hotel, Wrexham. Hughes, Corwen
 Sherriff, James, and James Henry Cox Lindsay, Great Winchester as buildings, East Indian Merchants. Dec 15 at 3 at offices of Lewis and Co, Old Jewry
 Shield, Henry William, Yiewsley, Middlesex, Barrister's Clerk. Dec 13 at 2 at office of Mirams, New Inn, Strand
 Steek, John, jun, Carlisle, Boot Maker. Dec 15 at 2 at office of Wright, Bank st, Carlisle
 Smith, Sarah, Bury, Lancashire, Hat Manufacturer. Dec 17 at 3 at office of Grundy and Co, Union st, Bury
 South, Sidney Smith, Sheerness, Kent, Grocer. Dec 15 at 12 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Copland, Sheerness
 Smith, William Francis, Hackney rd, Cheesomonger. Dec 15 at 11 at offices of Kent and Co, Basinghall st. Warrand, Ludgate hill
 Spiller, John, Swindon, Wilts, Upholsterer. Dec 12 at 12 at offices of Kinnaird and Tombs, Corn Exchange, Swindon
 Taylor, Dan, Halifax, York, Saddler. Dec 15 at 4 at offices of Storey, Cheapside, Halifax

Taylor, Samuel Cockshot, Morecambe, Lancashire, Joiner. Dec 13 at 10 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford
 Towns, Thomas Charles, Ramsgate, Kent, Coach Body Maker. Dec 16 at 1 at the Eagle, High st, Ramsgate. Delaunz, Canterbury
 Tregaskis, William, Falmouth, Cornwall, Printer. Dec 15 at 3 at office of Jenkins, Post Office buildings, Falmouth
 Tucker, William, Fenchurch st, Hatter. Dec 15 at 2 at office of Hubbard, Long lane. West Smithfield
 Turner, Arthur John, Birmingham, out of business. Dec 12 at 3 at office of Boraston, Ann st, Birmingham
 Valler, James, Walton st, Chelsea, Bootmaker. Dec 15 at 12 at offices of Murray, Sackville st, Piccadilly
 Wells, Augustus, Ivy lane, Newgate st, Licensed Victualler. Dec 24 at 10 at office of Brighten, Bishopsgate st Without
 Whittaker, John, Monks Copenhall, Cheshire, Farmer. Dec 15 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich rd, Crewe. Nordon, Liverpool
 Wiggins, Frederick Alphonso, Rochford, Essex, Auctioneer. Dec 11 at 3 at Mullen's Hotel, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside. Downing, Basinghall st
 Wood, David Edwin, Slough, Bucks, Outfitter. Dec 15 at 2 at offices of Durant, Guildhall chambers
 Wood, William, Sheffield, Grocer. Dec 16 at 12 at offices of Singleton, St James' row, Sheffield
 Woodruff, Thomas Frederick, Deal, Kent, Grocer. Dec 15 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Deal, Mercer, Deal
 York, William, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Boot Manufacturer. Dec 15 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Birmingham. Underhill, Wolverhampton

FRIDAY, Dec. 5, 1873.

Adams, Alfred William, Moystyn rd, Brixton, Merchant. Dec 16 at 12 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Campbell and Beaumont, Cannon st
 Avery, Edwin, and John Thomas Griffin, Bishopsgate st, Silk Merchants. Dec 15 at 2 at offices of Bailey, Tokenhouse yard
 Barber, Joshua, Carlworth, York, Woolen Cloth Manufacturer. Dec 17 at 3 at offices of Armitage, Lord st, Huddersfield
 Barry, Celia, and Alice Davis, Landport, Hants, Boot Sellers. Dec 16 at 3 at office of Waincoat, Union st, Portsea. Walker, Landport
 Bass, John, Ipswich, Suffolk, Builder. Dec 19 at 10 at offices of Villiamy, Tower st, Ipswich
 Bayley, John, Warrington, Lancashire, Chemist. Dec 17 at 3 at office of Davies and Co, Bewsey st, Warrington. Davies and Brook, Warrington
 Bettie, William, Ramsgate, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Dec 16 at 3 at 7, High st, Ramsgate. Sankey and Co, Margate
 Bettipsey, Thomas, Runcorn, Cheshire, Poultry Dealer. Dec 19 at 3 30 at the Bee Hotel, St John's lane, Liverpool. Day, Runcorn
 Brakes, Emily Rachael, Marquess rd, Canonbury, no occupation. Dec 19 at 12 at offices of Buchanan, Basinghall st
 Brend, John, Abbotsham, Devon, Shoemaker. Dec 22 at 2 at offices of Thorne, Castle st, Barnstable
 Brooks, George, Ashton st, Salmon's lane, Limehouse, out of business. Dec 15 at 12 at offices of Barton and Drew, Fore st
 Brown, Frederick William, and Frederick William Brown, jun, Aldersgate st, Tailors. Dec 18 at 3 at 33, Gutter lane. Cartlin, Basinghall st
 Butterhill, John, Ferrybridge, York, Boot Maker. Dec 20 at 11.30 at offices of Carter, Pontefract
 Buxton, Joseph Holmes, Compton terrace, Ilkington, Surgeon. Dec 18 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Hillcaries and Tunstall, Fenchurch buildings
 Chaplen, Henry, Fratton, Hants, Joiner. Dec 17 at 4 at office of King, Union st, Portsea
 Cockerton, Robert Blackburn, Houghton Green, Lancashire, Fellmonger. Dec 22 at 2 at office of Tyler and Co, North John st, Liverpool
 Cole, George, Hines st, Dover rd, Southwark. Rag Merchant. Dec 15 at 3 at office of Hicklin and Washington, Trinity square, Southwark
 Davies, William, Church st, Croydon, Bootmaker. Dec 29 at 3 at the Greyhound Hotel, Croydon. Young Gray's Inn square
 Edwards, Thomas, Tipton, Stafford, Cinder Dealer. Dec 15 at 3 at office of Travis, Church lane, Tipton
 Elliott, James, King st, Hammer-smith, Greengrocer. Dec 19 at 3 at the West Kensington Station Hotel, Russell rd, Kensington. Haynes, Wellesley rd, Croydon
 Forrest, Francis, Plumstead, Kent, Butcher. Dec 15 at 11 at offices of Elworthy, Brewer st, Woolwich
 Gale, James, Brompton, Kent, Printer. Dec 29 at 1 at offices of Wiloughby, Lancaster place, Sund. Bassett, Rochester
 Gilbert, Alfred, Osterham Junction, Surrey, Baker. Dec 18 at 2 at the Greyhound Hotel, Croydon. Hogan, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Glenister, Alfred, Abbott's Langley, Hertford, Blacksmith. Dec 24 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd
 Glover, John, Cossington-fields, Leicester, Farmer. Dec 18 at 3 at office of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester
 Goddard, Alfred Courtenay, Old Broad st, Russia Broker. Dec 16 at 12 at offices of McLeod and Watney, London st, Fenchurch st
 Gregg, Peter William, Mile End rd, Confectioner. Dec 19 at 1 at office of Barton and Drew, Fore st
 Gumbley, Joseph, Tonyrefail, Glamorgan, Farmer. Dec 18 at 12 at office of Morgan, Pontypidd
 Harbour, Thomas Alfred, Colchester, Essex, Assistant to a Boot Manufacturer. Dec 13 at the Essex Arms Inn, Butz rd, Colchester, in lieu of the place originally named
 Harding, William, Landport, Hants, Saddler. Dec 20 at 3 at offices of King, Union st, Portsea
 Heaven, William, Avening, Gloucester, Dealer. Dec 23 at 12 at office of Potter, Northfield House, North place, Cheltenham
 Hemming, Clement John, Handsworth, Stafford, Painter. Dec 19 at 3 at office of Maher and Fossas, Upper Temple st, Birmingham
 Hopkins, Joseph, Fonthrydendig, Cardigan, Builder. Dec 18 at 11 at office of Jones, Pier st, Aberystwith
 Hitchcock, Edward, Bishopsgate st Within, Wine Merchant. Dec 18 at 3 at offices of Waddell and Co, Queen Victoria st. Stockton and Jupp, Londenhall st
 Izman, Charles, Central st, St Luke's, Undertaker. Dec 19 at 12 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury square

Jenner, Horace, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Boot Maker. Dec 1 at 12 at the Incorporated Law Society's Rooms, Chancery lane, Jones, Hastings
 Joslin, David, Kimbly rd, Nunhead, Peckham, Mason. Dec 17 at 11 at the Guildhall Tavern. Keene and Marsland, Lower Thames st
 Kaul, Henry, City rd, Baker. Dec 13 at 3 at the Finsbury Hotel, Finsbury square. Hicks, Annis rd, South Hackney
 Kemp, Hubert Henry, Marchmont st, Brunswick square, Ironmonger. Dec 12 at 11 at offices of Willis, St Martin's court, Leicester square
 Knight, Charles Henry, Bognor, Sussex, Journalist. Dec 20 at 2 at offices of Luckett, Bedford row, Worthing
 Laurence, Thomas, Woolston, Worcester. Dec 19 at 3 at offices of Addison, High st, Brierley hill
 Mann, George, Bedford, Confectioner. Dec 18 at 13 at offices of Fox, Chancery lane. Conquest, Bedford
 McShane, Peter, Gateshead, Durham, Grocer. Dec 17 at 3 at office of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Meldrum, James, Stenhouse, and Albert Wylder, Manchester, Calico Printers. Dec 19 at 3 at offices of Wood, Princess st, Manchester
 Millard, William Francis, Sydenham, Kent, Printer. Dec 12 at 3 at offices of Ody, Trinity st, Southwark
 Newbury, George, Landport, Hants, Baker. Dec 18 at 4 at offices of King, Union st, Portsea
 Oram, Charles, Acaia rd, Wood Green, Commercial Clerk. Dec 19 at 3 at offices of Knight, Newgate st
 Owens, John, Pant-glas, Flint, Farmer. Dec 17 at 12 at the Mostyn Hotel, Mostyn. Jones, Conway
 Pocock, Lewis, Pall Mall, Picture Dealer. Dec 22 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook
 Price, Thomas, Denbigh, Wrexham, Wine Merchant. Dec 19 at 2 at offices of Bridgman and Co, Newgate st, Chester
 Prunieres, Bertrand, and Frederick Prunieres, Eden st, Hampstead rd, Cabinet Makers. Dec 15 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Philip and Behrend, Pancras lane, Queen st
 Reed, George, Inverness rd, Bayswater, General Dealer. Dec 13 at 2 at 19, Brunswick square. Allen
 Rosmer, William, Shearstone, Somerset, Wheelwright. Dec 18 at 12 at office of Reed and Cook, Bridgewater
 Rowland, Alexander Campbell, Southampton, Professor of Music. Dec 17 at 1 at offices of Bradby and Robins, Portland st, Southampton
 Sadler, Harvey Henry, Haybridge, Essex, Beer-seller. Dec 23 at 11 at the King's Head Inn, Maldon. Digby and Son, Maldon
 Saunders, Henry James, Tyler st, Regent st, Butcher. Dec 17 at 12 at offices of Hewlett, Serle st, Lincoln's Inn fids
 Sherman, Samuel, Allington st, Piccolo, Hairdresser. Dec 11 at 3 at offices of Bassett, Tichborne st, Regent circus
 Shaw, Henry, Timperley, Cheshire, Brickmaker. Dec 17 at 3 at offices of Nicholls and Co, High st, Altrincham
 Shawbrooke, Samuel, Taunton, Somerset, Builder. Dec 31 at 11 at offices of Kite, East st, Taunton
 Sherrin, Christians, Motcombe st, Belgrave square, Artificial Florist. Dec 15 at 2 at offices of Hutchinson, Vauxhall bridge rd
 Shiers, Michael, Brixton rd, Confectioner. Dec 22 at 11 at offices of Paddon and Son, Lincoln's Inn fields
 Skinner, William Barrett, Witney, Oxford, Upholsterer. Dec 17 at 11.30 at offices of Mallam, High st, Oxford
 Smith, Richard Henry, Beauchamp Rothing, Essex, Farmer. Dec 22 at 11 at offices of Blyth, Chelmsford. Smith, High Ongar
 Sperring, John Joseph, Bristol, Veterinary Surgeon. Dec 16 at 2 at offices of Lane, Lion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
 Stewart, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tailor. Dec 18 at 4 at the Neville Hotel, Neville st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Miles, Huddersfield
 Still, Frank, Salisbury, Wilts, General Warehouseman. Dec 17 at 3 at the Market House, Salisbury. Hodding
 Straight, Thomas, Teddington, Overbury, out of business. Dec 24 at 11 at the Swan Hotel, Tewkesbury. Martin, Fenchurch
 Symons, Robert, Tenby, Pembroke, Photographer. Dec 15 at 12 at the Townhall, Carmarthen. Stokes, Tenby
 Trout, George, Bath, Somerset, Auctioneer. Dec 20 at 12 at offices of Barrum, Northumberland buildings, Bath
 Tucker, William, Fenchurch st, Hatter. Dec 15 at offices of Lindo, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st, in lieu of the place originally named
 Turner, Robert, Bollington, near Macclesfield, Cheshire, Cotton Doubler. Dec 22 at 1 at the Turner's Arms, Inn, Bollington. Parrott and Co
 Vincent, Harriet Colston, Blaenavon, Monmouth, Innkeeper. Dec 19 at 2 at offices of Lloyd, Park terrace, Pontypool
 Wakelin, John, Ironmonger row, St Luke's, Licensed Victualler. Dec 17 at 3 at offices of Childley, Old Jewry
 Watson, James, Bacup, Lancashire, Painter. Dec 30 at 3 at the Dog and Partridge Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Sykes, Bacup
 Wayland, James Richard, Camden park rd, Camden square, Baker. Dec 19 at 2 at offices of Poole, Bartholomew close
 Wervill, Elizabeth, Sampford Brett, Somerset, out of business. Dec 22 at 12 at offices of Ward, Broad st, Bristol
 Wilderspin, Robert, Bethnal Green rd, Greengrocer. Dec 18 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Hatton garden, Holborn
 Wilson, Richard, Northwich, Cheshire, Grocer. Dec 9 at 11 at the Wheat Sheaf Inn, Orer
 Woodward, Benjamin, Kidderminster, Worcester, Carpet and Rug Manufacturer. Dec 17 at 3 at the Lion Hotel, Kidderminster. Morton, Kidderminster
 Zerlendi, Nicolas Michel, Great Winchester st, Merchant. Dec 22 at 2 at offices of Kemp and Co, Walbrook. Hillyer and Co, Fenchurch street

TUESDAY, Dec. 9, 1873.

Aston, Joseph, Kentish Town rd, Ironmonger. Dec 23 at 12 at offices of Jones, Walbrook buildings, Walbrook
 Barker, John Theodor, Furnival's Inn, Holborn, Architect. Dec 22 at 2 at offices of Fryer, Gray's Inn place
 Billington, John, Southfield rd, Tarnham Green, Market Gardener. Dec 23 at 1 at offices of Brown and Waters, Lincoln's Inn fields
 Bird, Leonard Stanley, Whitehill, Gloucester, Shoemaker. Dec 20 at 3 at offices of Jackson, London rd, Stroud
 Bowstead, John Francis, Birmingham, Merchant. Dec 18 at 3 at offices of Fitter, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Bryan, Thomas, Longton, Stafford, Grocer. Dec 22 at 11 at offices of Tomkinson, Hanover st, Burslem

Burghall, Edgar, Liverpool, Book keeper. Dec 29 at 12 at the Stork Hotel, Queen's square, Liverpool. Bridgeman and Co, Cheshire

Burn, William, Blyth, Northumberland, Builder. Dec 19 at 12 at offices of Garbutt, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Bushby, Robert William, Begon, Saxe, Farmer. Dec 26 at 11 at the Dolphin Hotel, Chichester. Arnold, Chichester

Calvert, John, Leeds, Tailor. Dec 23 at 2 at offices of Carr, Albion st, Leeds

Carr, Frederick William, Old Castle st, Bathnal Green, Cook shop Keeper. Dec 24 at 2 at offices of Mind, St Benet place, Graecchurch street

Canell, George, Tenster, Little Moorfields, Packing Case Manufacturer. Dec 23 at 11 at 22, Tenster st. Hicks, Annis rd, South Hackney

Dann, James, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. Dec 23 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Pooking-on's walk, Leicester

Davis, Solomon, Wilegate st, Bishopgate Without, Leather Merchant. Dec 19 at 12 at offices of Levinton, Bishopgate st

Dawkins, Edward James, Bristol, Clerk. Dec 19 at 2 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol

Evans, Evan Harris, Glamorgan, Aberdare, Barman. Dec 20 at 1 at offices of Simons and Plews, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Fairlie, Charles Shakspeare, Princes st, Rotherhithe, Tarpanin Manufacturer. Dec 17 at 1 at offices of Mind, St Benet place, Graecchurch street

Farrow, John Wesley, Bulwell, Nottingham, no occupation. Dec 27 at 2 at offices of Oranch and Co, Low pavement, Nottingham

Farrow, Joseph, Colechester, Essex, out of business. Dec 22 at 12 at offices of Prior, Culver st, Colchester

Foy, Michael Joseph, Leonminster, Hereford, Boot Maker. Dec 23 at 12 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Leonminster. Gregg, Leonminster

Fraser, James, and George Purdie, Sunderland, Durham, Contractors. Dec 22 at 1 at offices of Hall, Villiers st Sunderland

Fryatt, Walter Frederick, Goswell rd, Clerkenwell, Artist Colourman. Dec 17 at 11 at offices of Coles and Co, Bishopgate within, Dobson, Southampton buildings

Fyrmore, Eliza, Great Cambridge st, Hackney rd, Lodging house Keeper. Dec 17 at 2 at Sanderson's Hotel, Bevis court, Basinghall st

Garthorn, Mary, Carlisle, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Dec 22 at 2 at offices of McAlpin, Devonshire st, Carlisle

Gillman, Joseph Copeland, Manchester, Commission Merchant. Dec 20 at 2 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester

Hardy, Martha, Rochdale, Lancashire, Milliner. Dec 17 at 2 at the Home Trade Association, York st, Manchester, in lieu of the piece originally named

Harley, Richard, Bishwark, York, Fuller. Dec 19 at 11 at offices of Longbottom, Waterhouse st, Halifax

Hawkes, Walter, Cambridge, Butcher. Dec 23 at 11 at offices of Ellison and Burrows, Alexander st, Petty Cury Cambridge

Holland, Henry Richard, Walsall, Stafford, out of business. Dec 23 at 11 at offices of Adams, Goodall st, Walsall

Impey, Thomas, Ironmanger lane, Auctioneer. Dec 23 at 12 at offices of Nicholson, London Bridge Railway Approach. Turner, London Bridge Railway Approach

Jacob, Philip, Birmingham, Oil and Colour Dealer. Dec 17 at 10 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham

Joubert, Henri Charles Rene, and Joes Joubert, Percy st, Bedford square, Upholsterers. Dec 19 at 2 at offices of Barker, St. Michael's House, St. Michael's alley, Cornhill

King, George Briggs, Birmingham, Commission Agent. Dec 23 at 12 at offices of Griffin, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Knowles, Joseph, and James Parker, Manchester, Cotton Waste Dealers. Dec 23 at 2 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester

Langley, William, Wensbeck rd, Victoria Park, out of business. Dec 22 at 11 at offices of Swaine, Cheapside

Lee, Henry Michael, Carburton st, Great Portland st, Patentee. Dec 19 at 11 at offices of Lind, Beaufort buildings, Strand

Laing, George, Hoylake, Cheshire, Student of Theology. Dec 30 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Anderson and Co, Liverpool

Marriman, William, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Mercer. Dec 22 at 11:30 at offices of Skinner, John st, Sunderland

Mills, Francis, Tonbridge st, Euston rd, Beerhouse Keeper. Dec 23 at 11 at offices of Lovering, Gresham st. Harston, Gresham st

Mitonette, Frederick, Deepfields, Sadgley, Stafford, Iron Broker. Dec 30 at 12 at office of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Molleson, William, Jun, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Painter. Dec 23 at 3 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zeland rd, Middlesbrough

Opies, William, Bolton, Lancashire, Tin plate Worker. Dec 24 at 10 at office of Richardson and Downing, Wood st, Bolton

Ouseworth, William Henry, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer. Dec 23 at 11 at the Wharton's Hotel, Park lane, Leeds. Harle

Owen, Thomas, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Wine Merchant. Dec 30 at 2 at the Biosmos Hotel, Forgate st, Chester. Dallow, Wolverhampton

Payne, Walter, Slough, Bucks, Bootmaker. Dec 30 at 2 at offices of Gwyther, Coleman st

Pearce, William, and Richard Joseph Wood, Mark lane, Tea Dealers. Dec 21 at 2 at offices of Bastard, Broad court

Petty, William Henry, South st, Finsbury, Merchant. Jan 2 at 11 at the Guildhall Coffeehouse, Gresham st. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle st

Phillips, Benjamin, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Draper. Dec 18 at 11 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Davies and Hartland, Swansea

Poole, Henry, Beoley, Worcester, Wheelwright. Dec 19 at 11 at offices of Blewitt, Ann st, Birmingham

Priest, John, Tettenhall, Stafford, out of business. Dec 20 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Prior, Charles, Hereford, Builder. Dec 30 at 2:30 at offices of Corner, High town, Hereford

Reed, Sarah, Scarborough, York, Linen Draper. Dec 22 at 1 at offices of Hooks and Midgley, Boar lane, Leeds

Rehail, William Raab, Collumpton, Devon, Druggist. Dec 23 at 11 at offices of Andrew, Bedford circus, Exeter

Savage, Stephen, Bangor, Carnarvon, Licensed Victualler. Dec 22 at 2 at the Friars' Vaults, High st, Bangor. Foulkes, Bangor

Simpson, Joseph, Budge row, Cannon st, Engineer. Jan 2 at 2 at offices of Brown, Basinghall st

Spence, Thomas William, Darlington, Durham, Retailer of Beer. Dec 23 at 2 at offices of Robinson, Chancery lane, Darlington

Taylor, William Potter, Penryn, Cornwall, Draper. Dec 22 at 12 at office of Carlyon and Paul, Quay st, Truro

Traynor, Christopher Sheffield, Hair Dresser. Dec 19 at 4 at offices of Gee, Fig Tree chambers, Sheffield

Tugman, Samuel, and Sylvester Christopher Bradshaw, Liverpool, Merchants. Dec 29 at 1 at the Law Association Rooms, 14, Cook st, Liverpool. Thornely and Dismore, Liverpool

Vaughan, William, Welshpool, Montgomery, Innkeeper. Dec 20 at 12 at offices of Harrison and Son, Welshpool

Watts, Edwards, Ashcott, Somerset, Grocer. Dec 18 at 12 at the Railway Hotel, Bridgewater. Hobbs, Jun, Wells

Whalley, Richard, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Wine Merchant. Dec 19 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Whittemith, John Thomas, Kidderminster, Worcester, Boot Manufacturer. Dec 22 at 3 at offices of Corbet, Baxter chambers, Kidderminster

Whitehead, James, Coburn row, Bow, Agent. Dec 22 at 3 at offices of Swaine, Cheapside

Wilkins, Matthew, Loxley, near Birmingham, Oil merchant. Dec 19 at 12 at offices of Free, Temple row, Birmingham

Williams, Thomas, Birmingham, Grocer. Dec 19 at 10 at offices of Boston, Victoria buildings, Temple row, Birmingham

Wilson, Peter, Sulton, Huntingdon, Baker. Dec 20 at 11 at the Wentworth Hotel, Peterborough. Graves, Whiteley

Wood, Rueben, Manchester, Journeyman Tripe Dresser. Dec 23 at 12 at offices of Homer and Sons, Kidgfield, Manchester. Law, Manchester

Woodhead, Henry, Sheffield, Beerhouse Keeper. Dec 23 at 12 at office of Farnell, St James's street, Sheffield

Woodman, Thomas, Tipton, Stafford, Hosier. Dec 22 at 3 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Yandell, Samuel, Bishop-hall, Taunton, Somerset, Carpenter. Dec 23 at 1 at offices of Reed and Cook, Paul st, Taunton

Zucker, Charles, Kensington Park rd, Notting hill, Watch Maker. Dec 16 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Lincoln's inn fields

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 2, Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.
SYMONDS INN, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Chancery Bills and Answers	Catalogues
Appeals	Prospectuses
Parliamentary Minutes	Magazines
Books	Newspapers
Pamphlets	Circulars
Reports	Posters
Rule	Handbills, &c., &c.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.
BAKER-STREET.—Great Attractions.—The CARRIAGE used by NAPOLEON III. at Metz, Châlons, and Sedan, with numerous relics of the campaign of 1870. Portrait Models of MARSHAL'S BAZAINE and McMAHON, M. THIERS, FRANCIS JOSEPH of AUSTRIA, and the SHAH of PERSIA, with the original autograph and testimonial presented to Madame Tussaud and Sons, July 3rd, 1873, as a souvenir of His Imperial Majesty's visit, are now added; also, new superb and costly Court dresses. Admission, 1s. Children under ten, 6d. Extra rooms, 6d. Open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Travellers' Safety.—TWO new LECTURES—the first, SAFETY AT SEA (in which will be discussed the best method of lowering boats); the second lecture, SAFETY ON LAND (in which railway matters will be discussed) will shortly follow. Mr. Howard Paul during the week. Jane Conquest. Sugar and the Silver Light, by Professor Gardner. Domestic Electricity, Mr. King. Other entertainments. Open 12 and 7. Admission 1s.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.—Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Dame Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June, 18, 1864, 446 page.
The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

AT BIRCHIN LANE, 1740-1873.

WITHERBY & CO.,
Law and General
STATIONERS, PRINTERS, & LITHOGRAPHERS,
Have removed to more commodious Premises in
NEWMAN'S COURT, CORNHILL.

Steam Printing Works—Middle Row Place, Holborn.

THE LAW ALMANACK for 1874, price 9d.
Published by THOMAS SCOTT, Warwick-court, Holborn; SUTTON
& Co., Paternoster-row, PEACOCK, Salisbury-square; and sold by all
Law Booksellers and Stationers.

EXERCISES on ABSTRACTS of TITLE to
FREEHOLD, COPYHOLD, and LEASEHOLD ESTATES and
PERSONALTY, with observations and requisitions on the several titles.
Price 7s. 6d.

This book contains a series of easy Exercises in Conveyancing Law
for the use and information of Law Students and Articled Clerks, with
Explanatory Observations and Requisitions.

A moderate application to and study of, these Abstracts would
enable the Student to peruse and understand any ordinary Abstract of
Title.

HACONSON & Co., 10, Paternoster-row, London, E.C.

Third Edition,
CRACROFT'S INVESTORS' and SOLICITORS'
MEMORANDUM BOOK OF PURCHASES and SALES, with
CALCULATIONS Adapted to Every Investment. An additional por-
tion especially adapted for the Legal Profession, containing Forms of
Entry for Freehold and Copyhold Property; Leasehold, Let and Held;
Mortgages, Held and Effected; Insurances; Bills and Promissory
Notes; Money Advanced or Borrowed.

"The object of this Memorandum Book is to enable every Investor to
keep a systematic Record, producible in a Court of Law, of every in-
vestment transaction entered into. No such record was in existence
previous to the first edition."

Second Edition,
CRACROFT'S "CONSOLS CHART," showing the
Highest and Lowest Prices of Three per Cent. Consols each year
from the French Revolution of 1789 to the Present Time, with the
Growth and Decline of the National Funded Debt of Great Britain;
the Yearly Average of the Bank Rate of Discount, and Tabulated State-
ment of the Principal Events Affecting the Price of Stocks.

"Diagrams are sometimes not very simple, but the present one is
clearness itself—an interesting commentary on English history for
the period in question."—Economist.

Price 2s.; or, mounted on roller, 3s. 6d.

London: EDWARD STAMFORD, Charing-cross.

BERNARD CRACROFT, Stock and Share Broker, 5, Austin-friars, E.C.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use.
MEMORANDA and ARTICLES of ASSOCIATION speedily printed
in the proper form for registration and distribution. **SHARE CER-**
TIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. **OFFICIAL**
SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Com-
panies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-
street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn)
Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and
COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to
direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages
of his long experience of upwards of twenty-five years, in the special in-
sertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued
support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest
care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertise-
ment and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra,
Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms cus-
tomary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit
balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.—
At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 13 months' notice of withdrawal.
For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.
BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches
of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent
or collection.

SALES and PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in
East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.
Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised.

Every other description of banking business and money agency
British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

LAW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY. Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.

Capital, One Million Sterling, fully subscribed by upwards of 400 share-
holders, nearly all of whom are members of the legal profession.

Chairman—Sir WILLIAM FOSTER, Bart., Norwich.
Deputy-Chairman—JAMES CUDDON Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldenmin-
ing, Temple.

The Capital subscribed and Funds in hand amount to upwards of
£1,330,000, affording unquestionable security.

The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy,
which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interests and
Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance
Sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to
FRANK M'GEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

TO SOLICITORS and OTHERS.—New Bridge-
street, To be Let, first-class Suites of Offices on the ground, first,
second, and third floors of excellent newly-decorated premises. Also
extensive cellars on basement. Full particulars of Messrs. Deben-
ham, Tewson, & Farmer, 80, Cheapside.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S

LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including
Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting
Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and
Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month,
and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C.,
or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for in-
spection should be received not later than four days previous to the end
of the preceding month.

ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET.

Messrs. VENTNOM, BULL & COOPER'S Monthly Register, contain-
ing full particulars of Estates and Farms, Furnished and Unfurnished
Houses in town and country, Ground Rents and Investments generally,
may be had free on application or by post for one stamp. Owners
having properties for disposal are invited to send full particulars to the
Auction and Estate Agency Offices, 8, Bucklersbury, E.C.

NO END OF WORRY SAVED BY THE USE OF
STONE'S PATENT BOOK BOXES, for the safe
and orderly keeping of all papers and documents, printed and
manuscript. Prices from 2s. 6d. to 7s. 6d. Sold by all booksellers and
stationers. A sample box sent, carriage paid, to any railway station in
England, by HENRY STONE, Manufacturer, Banbury.

IMPROVED and ECONOMIC COOKERY.—Use
LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT as "stock" for broths,
soups, made dishes and sauces; gives fine flavour and great
strength. Invariably adopted in households when fairly tried.
CAUTION.—Genuine only with Baron Liebig's facsimile across label.